DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 113 95 SP 009 362

AUTHOR	Steinmetz, Andres; And Others
TITLE	Evaluating the Teacher Center Pilots: The Third Annual Report, 1974-1975. Volume 4, The Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Evaluation Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	31 Jul 75
NOTE	163p.; For related documents, see SP 009 359-361
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Planning; Educational Administration; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Program Descriptions; Surveys; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This three-part report evaluates the progress of the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (TCIES), and examines the nature and extent of collaboration at each of five Local Cooperative Teacher Education Centers (LCTECs) in Texas. Part 1 discusses the development and operation of the Texas Center from July 1971 through December 1974. Part 2 focuses on collaboration at the following LTEC sites: San Antonio, Dallas, West Texas, Houston, and Fort Worth. This section includes descriptions of the centers and survey procedures. Part 3 presents the findings of the study. A set of topics on collaborative activities is presented and each LCTEC is discussed separately in relation to that subject. Topics include the following: (a) goals; (b) bylaws and organizational structure; (c) meetings: number, attendance and purpose; (d) executive resources and roles; (e) funds; (f) physical facilities; (g) selection, tenure, orientation, and resources of members; (h) roles of partners; (i) activities; (j) leadership; (k) linkages; (l) effects; (m) summary and implications based on LCTEC site interviews; (n) additional insights based on interviews with TCIES Executive Committee members; and (o) general remarks. (JS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED109113

EVALUATING THE TEACHER CENTER PILOTS:

THE THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

1974-1975

Volume IV

THE TEXAS CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by

Evaluation Research Center
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

July 31, 1975

SP009362

The research report herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Introduction

- A. Background iii
- B. Events Leading Up to This Year's Work iv

Chapter 1: A Brief Project History

- A. Purpose of This Chapter 1
- B. A Brief History of TCIES 1
- C. The Legal Mandates for Collaboration 9

Chapter 2: Methodology

- A. The Topic of This Study 12
- B. The Five LCTECs Chosen for This Study 14
- C. Procedures 16

Chapter 3: Findings

- A. Contents and Organization of This Chapter 20
- B. LCTEC Authority, Goals and Institutional Membership 20
  - San Antonio 21
  - Dallas 22
  - West Texas 23
  - Houston 24
  - Fort Worth 25
- Summary of Advisory Council Membership at Each LCTEC (Table 2) 26

C. Bylaws and Organizational Structure 27

San Antonio 27
Dallas 29
West Texas 34
Houston 35
Fort Worth 36

D. Meetings: Number, Attendance and Purpose 38

San Antonio 38
Dallas 38
West Texas 39
Houston 40
Fort Worth 41

E. Executive Resources and Roles 42

San Antonio 42
Dallas 43
West Texas 45
Houston 46
Fort Worth 47

F. Funds 48

San Antonio 49
Dallas 50
West Texas 51
Houston 51
Fort Worth 52

G. Physical Facilities

San Antonio 53
Dallas 53
West Texas 54
Houston 54
Fort Worth 54

H. Selection, Tenure, Orientation and Resources of Members

San Antonio 55
Dallas 56

West Texas 59
Houston 60
Fort Worth 62

I. Roles of the Partners 64

Stereotypes 64
Rewards 68

San Antonio 70
Dallas 74
West Texas 79
Houston 81
Fort Worth 85

J. Activities of the Council

San Antonio 88
Dallas 89
West Texas 91
Houston 93
Fort Worth 96

K. Leadership

San Antonio 98
Dallas 98
West Texas 99
Houston 100
Fort Worth 102

L. Linkages

San Antonio 103
Dallas 103
West Texas 104
Houston 104
Fort Worth 105

M. Effects

San Antonio 106
Dallas 107
West Texas 108
Houston 109
Fort Worth 111

N. Summary and Implications Based on LCTEC Site Interviews 112

- San Antonio 112
- Dallas 114
- West Texas 120
- Houston 122
- Fort Worth 123

O. Additional Insights Based on Interviews with TCIES Executive Committee Members 125

- The TCIES Executive Committee 125
- The Executive Committee's Input to Decision Making 127
- Nature of Interaction of Members 128
- Characterizing Local Teacher Centers 129
- The Emerging Interest in Collaboration 135

P. General Remarks 140

- The Teacher Center Mission 142
- Organizational Structure 145
- Communication 147

Bibliography 151

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this document was made possible through the assistance, cooperation and generous sharing of information of many Texans.

First, we are indebted to L. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner of Education, and C. Kyle Killough, Director of the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (TCIES) who have continuously provided information about the project's development and who have shown professional courage in suggesting that the staff at the Evaluation Research Center explore the collaborative process in TCIES. Dr. Killough's gracious assistance to ERC personnel in the conduct of the evaluation was also greatly appreciated.

Next, thanks are due to the Teacher Center project directors who aided the authors in their field activity and who provided critical current project information: Dwayne Kingery, Dallas; Paul Pearson and Jo Moseley, Fort Worth; W. Robert Houston, Houston; Dwain Estes, San Antonio; and James L. Kidd, Canyon, Texas.

We also wish to express out gratitude to the members of the TCIES executive committee and Teacher Center advisory group who generously shared their perceptions of the roles and relationships of the various partners in Teacher Center collaboration with us.

Special thanks are due to members of the ERC production staff: Marilyn Hathaway, who assisted in the coordination of field work and the preparation

of the report, and Bonnie Herndon, who provided able editorial assistance.

This report represents the joint efforts of the authors, all of whom conducted the evaluation work in Texas. The initial draft was prepared by Andres Steinmetz, assistant professor at the University of Virginia and ERC evaluator, who performed the difficult task of integrating three sets of field reports; consultants Jane Siegel, external evaluation consultant, and Egon Guba, professor of education at Indiana University, reviewed and revised that initial draft along with Dr. Steinmetz.

Finally, the authors acknowledge the contributions of others, but assume responsibility for any errors or misconceptions.

Andres Steinmetz
Egon Guba
Jane Siegel

INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

During the second half of 1971 the Office of Education through the Teacher Center Program funded four pilot projects, one in Texas, one in Rhode Island, one in the Bay Area in California, and one in Washington, D.C. All are still in existence except Washington, which was discontinued in 1974. From 1971 to the present the staff at the Evaluation Research Center has provided a variety of evaluation services to these pilot projects. A list of reports prepared by the staff at ERC for this time period may be found in the bibliography at the end of this volume.

This document reports on the fourth year of evaluation and technical assistance rendered by the Evaluation Research Center to the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Services (TCIES). It discusses the nature and extent of collaboration among Teacher Center partners (representatives of local school districts, institutions of higher education, education service centers, the state education agencies, and the community).

It is one of four reports prepared simultaneously: Volume III deals with the work of ERC's evaluators with the Rhode Island Teacher Center; Volume II deals with the Bay Area Learning Center during 1974-75; Volume I cuts across the three Teacher Center pilots and offers some generalizations concerning the Teacher Center idea based on ERC's association with it at the program level (Office of Education) and the project level (through evaluation work and technical assistance delivered to the Teacher Center pilots themselves).

B. EVENTS LEADING UP TO THIS YEAR'S WORK

In August 1974 ERC's evaluators began to plan the 1974-75 external evaluation effort for the Teacher Center pilot projects. The primary focus of the work was to identify and select the most promising aspects of each project--structures, processes, programs, and so forth--for in-depth study and validation.* The purpose of this activity was to develop the basis for an application model of Teacher Centers.

Procedures for identification and selection of aspects or areas of each pilot to be studied included: (1) a careful review of all internal and external documents available to the ERC staff; (2) an examination of previously collected evaluation data (especially the impact survey results); (3) considering the input from USOE and Teacher Center officials; and (4) an analysis of all three items above. The first two procedures were straightforward, albeit time-consuming, tasks. The third activity involved a rewarding but more complex process that seems to warrant description.

As an outcome of a productive meeting of numerous interested parties, held in Washington, D.C. in February 1974, a Teacher Center Consortium was formed. For 1974-75 this consortium included as members: Teacher Center pilot project directors; regional OE project officers; ERC representatives; and, as chairmen, the directors of the University of South Florida LTI on Education Personnel Development.

---

* "Validation" is used in this case to describe a verification process including review of documents, on-site observation, and interviews.

During a series of Teacher Center Consortium meetings, held in September and November 1974, and January 1975, discussions were held about the external evaluation of the Teacher Center pilots. Further, activities were carried out that ensured consortium members an opportunity to identify and select promising aspects of the projects for in-depth study in 1974-75. These activities included first, a list of primary choices of promising aspects, drawn up by each project director. These lists specified their selection criteria** and indicated the availability and nature of documentation which would validate their choices; then they presented their evaluation plan, which called for further study of the following aspects of Teacher Centers by site:

- Bay Area Learning Center (BALC) - The nature and extent of tri-district collaboration and staff development program activity was to be surveyed as was the START Center in Oakland in order to gather impact data on one of the three local education agency staff development centers supported by BALC.
- Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC) - Three aspects of the state education agency based project were to be examined. (1) technical

---

** Examples of selection criteria were the extent to which an activity or aspect of the project contributed to the attainment of its goals or was rated particularly important to Teacher Center clients.

assistance to local education agencies by generalist consultants; (2) information service to educators; and (3) staff development assistance to local education agencies. Also, impact data about the project's major components was to be collected and analyzed. Following discussion and clarification of the evaluation plan for BALC and RITC presented by the ERC staff, the Teacher Center directors, OE officials and ERC representatives agreed to the conditions of its acceptance.

- Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (TCIES) - At first a further study of two of the several TCIES-supported Teacher Center projects was considered. Dallas and Houston were selected in order to collect data on an urban local education agency-based project and a university and competency-based teacher education (CBTE) effort respectively. Later, however, ERC, OE and TCIES officials agreed upon a broader effort: it was decided to conduct a study aimed at validating the existence of collaborative educational activity among local education agencies, institutions of higher education, state education agencies, education service centers, and community representatives in Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, and Canyon/Amarillo.

The reasons for selecting these sites as well as some brief programmatic information on each one is presented in Chapter 2, Section B.

CHAPTER 1

A BRIEF PROJECT HISTORY

A. PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to orient the reader briefly to the development and operation of this project over the time period July 1971 to December 1974. The reader familiar with the project at least in outline may wish to skip this chapter.

A report being prepared by the Leadership Training Institute at the University of South Florida and scheduled for distribution in the summer of 1975 contains further details on the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (TCIES).

B. A BRIEF HISTORY OF TCIES[1]

The Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems is a facilitating agency intended to improve teacher education in Texas. It evolved from a series of developmental efforts that began in 1961, with the Texas Student Teacher Project. Supported by the Ford Foundation in order to test the notion that improvements in teacher education could be made through broad scale involvement of professional educators, student teachers and citizens in this early project organized a series of meetings throughout Texas to discuss needed changes in teacher education. From those meetings came a clear indication that "large scale change would require new kinds of institutional cooperation, revised teacher standards, and additional legislative as well as financial support at the state level."

---

[1] The history presented in this section is excerpted from Volume IV, The Texas Teacher Center, Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, June 30, 1973 by Dr. John B. Peper. (I 80 Tex)

Then, in 1967, the Education Professions Development Act was passed specifically to provide assistance to state departments of education, the teaching profession, and universities and school districts in developing models of teacher education improvement programs. In the first operational year of the act, four regionally-based Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) projects were approved including one at Southeastern Oklahoma State University. The Oklahoma- Texas project funded the Dallas Independent School District Teacher Training Complex. This complex was in operation a full year before Texas, as a state, submitted a multi-institutional proposal for funding of a series of lighthouse Teacher Center projects.

Included in this 1970-71 Texas performance-based TTT project were proposals from the University of Houston, Texas Christian University at Fort Worth, West Texas State University at Canyon, the University of Texas at El Paso, and the Dallas Independent School District. In 1971-72 it was envisioned that each pilot site would develop an educational cooperative as well as a performance-based system of preservice education within the university in cooperation with the service center and the local school district. The project design also included a statewide coordination

11

function to be administered within the Texas Education Agency. Although the statewide coordination was desirable, it soon became evident that existing intra-agency staff and facilities would need to be augmented by additional resources in order to make the efforts of this project conform to the requirements being mandated simultaneously by the state legislature.

In order to enhance the statewide coordination of the TTT Program, and to link the performance/competency-based educational program development to statewide educational legislation reform movements, the Texas Educational Renewal Center (TERC) was established in 1971. Its first director was C. Kyle Killough, who had formerly been the architect and director of the Dallas Independent School District's Teacher Training Complex. In 1973, TERC became the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (TCIES).

The staff of the center was kept small deliberately in order to serve as a facilitative and organizing resource rather than as a large direction and control agency. During the first year of operations (1971-72) TERC identified three major thrusts, namely, project management, Teacher Center development, and learning products installation.

Concurrent to these project developments, important legislative changes were occurring in regard to both preservice and in-service teacher education programs in Texas. One of the direct byproducts of the personnel training conference sponsored by the Texas State Teacher Project with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation in 1961 was a set of education bills passed in the Texas legislature in 1969. Senate Bill 8, known as the Texas Student Teaching Act, was written specifically to make responsibility for teacher education in the clinical setting a joint responsibility of the local school district and the university. House Bill 240, though not a direct outgrowth, did make funding a provision in the basic salary guide for ten days of in-service training for every teacher in the state each year.

Under SB 8, approved programs were to be presented by local Teacher Education Centers to the Texas Education Agency for certification approval. The TEA, with the assistance of colleges, universities and public school personnel, was directed to establish standards for approval of public school districts to serve as Student Teacher Centers, and to define the cooperative relationship between the college or university and the public school that serves the student-teaching program.

Both the public school district serving as a student teacher center and the college or university using its facilities were to share joint responsibility for selection and approval of supervising teachers. Employees of the district were to serve in the program, and they were required to adopt agreed upon continuing in-service improvement programs for the supervising teachers. Fiscal support of the program was provided in the amount of $250 per student teacher.

The implications of SB 8 were far-reaching in their directions toward changing traditional means of teacher education. In addition, the Texas Education Agency took impetus from the bill for the development of new standards for teacher certification and school district certification.

The state board of education passed six new certification standards in 1972 plus new accreditation standards for public schools to be phased in over a five year period. (The certification standards were changed in 1974-75 as the result of an opinion issued by the Texas attorney general to the effect that performance or competency-based teacher education/certification could not be the sole, mandated mode for certification.)

It is apparent, then, that a systemic improvement process has been mandated by legislative and regulatory authorities in Texas. First, preservice teacher education was to become a multiple institutional responsibility with cooperation between local districts, universities and the Texas Education Agency. Second, an organization known as a local Teacher Education Center was required. Third, ten days of in-service training was required. Perhaps of greatest significance was the requirement to establish local Teacher Centers which provided an organizational imperative for cooperative preservice program development.

Obviously, the legislative mandates enumerated above required a coordinating and information structure to augment the Texas Education Agency's effort to ensure compliance. The Teacher Center project was designated by the commissioner of education to take a facilitating and coordinating role with respect to this effort. The lighthouse Teacher Centers, training conferences for deans of colleges of education, and change agent training and product installation all contributed significantly to the progress of this movement, but much more effort was to be required over the next few years if these programs could be expected to achieve their intended purpose.

In the 1972-73 Teacher Center proposal an effort was made to show the relationship between TERC, the Texas Education Agency, the Texas performance based TTT components, the various associated national groups, and the local Teacher Centers. The 1972-73 proposal was actually a joint proposal for TERC and the Texas performance-based TTT components project.

Approval of the single proposal would appear to have provided a unified project, but the unity was not achieved until February 1973, when a meeting was held jointly between the state Steering Committee for the TTT component and the TERC Advisory Board. At the joint meeting the two boards voted to merge into a new board with a much larger representative base to serve the Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems.

During 1972-73 the TCIES project was composed of seven major components (areas of activity or functions). They were: (1) management, (2) Teacher Center development, (3) proven products installation, (4) evaluation, (5) national linkages, (6) change agent support, and (7) information services. These components seemed to be highly interactive and, at times, indistinguishable in operation. The concept of the Local Cooperative Teacher Education Center (LCTEC) grew out of an attempt to provide a vehicle that could deliver systemic changes in the other components in the training of educational personnel. The Texas performance-based TTT projects (Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, West Texas) provided a structure for the emergent legislative and administrative action for improving teacher training in Texas. The underlying goals of the TTT projects as well as the TCIES Teacher Center projects were: (1) that teacher education must be performance-based; (2) that the setting for teacher education should be an educational cooperative; and (3) that teacher education must form an integral part of the educational reform movement.

A Teacher Center within the TCIES concept was, then, a cooperative of educational institutions designed to improve teacher education within a given geographic region. Membership in the cooperative was to include representation from (1) local school districts, (2) colleges and universities, (3) education service centers, (4) the organized teaching profession, and (5) the community served by the Teacher Center. To satisfy its fiscal responsibilities, one of the members of the cooperative served as the designated fiscal agent, for state requirements decreed that the fiscal agent must either be a local school district, a college or university, or the education service center.

A TCIES Teacher Center therefore is not just a physical plant but an organization that might be termed a holding company, although its educational program may be operated from buildings and other facilities of one or more of the member institutions. All these factors contribute to the understanding of the project and its basic purpose; all of which must be grasped if the Teacher Center concept is to be understood.

Development of Teacher Centers has represented a sophisticated attempt to share decision making, power and authority in new ways. The most difficult task in the project in 1972-73 was explaining the virtues of the program to each participating institution in order to gain its cooperation.

In 1973-74 the TCIES project continued the same thrusts, except that it ceased to train additional change agents. There were a total of twenty-one Teacher Centers operating at various levels of development with TCIES support by that time. To learn more about the nature of the Texas Teacher Center project, a series of evaluation activities was conducted during 1973-74. They included:

- developing a detailed program design for five fully operational sites: Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, and West Texas State University at Canyon;
- conducting a survey to determine the level of installation and impact of major components of each local Teacher Center in these five sites; and
- studying the development and condition of the TCIES project and its relationship to the Teacher Centers.

A brief overview of the five Teacher Center projects and some recent survey results are provided in Chapter 2, Section B, of this volume. The remainder of this section addresses the recent history of TCIES.

The accomplishments of TCIES (by now a staff of two professionals) as of 1974 were numerous.[2] For example, Teacher Centers developed through TCIES support existed. They were operational and individual teachers and students felt they were receiving better training. Other examples include: provision of many training activities; improved communication among representatives of various institutions; and the emergence of a dedicated and able cadre of leaders.

There were, however, some factors impinging upon the development and performance of TCIES, such as unstable funding, changes in mission, and certification complications. Additional and crucial factors of concern, which led to the study that is presented in the remainder of this volume, were organizational in nature and called for an examination of Teacher Center structures, communication, reward mechanisms, and the nature of the collaborative process implied in the TCIES concept of Teacher Centers.

C. THE LEGAL MANDATES FOR COLLABORATION

A key factor in the growth of the Teacher Centers in Texas was the enactment of Senate Bill 8 by the legislature of the state. SB 8, which became effective September 1, 1969, provided for the implementation of a program of student training. Four of its sections are as follows:

> Section 1. To provide college students, facilities and supervision for student teaching experience required by law as a prerequisite

---

[2] Comments contained in this segment of the report were excerpted from a report on TCIES prepared by Dr. Egon Guba for ERC in June 1974. (I 91 Tex)

to the issuance of a valid Texas Teaching Certificate, it is necessary that joint responsibility among the colleges or universities approved for teacher education by the State Board of Education of this state, the Texas Public School districts, and the State of Texas be hereby established.

Section 2. The Central Education Agency, with the assistance of colleges, universities, and public school personnel, shall establish standards for approval of public school districts to serve as Student Teaching Centers and define the cooperative relationship between the college or university and the public school which serves the student teaching program.

Section 3. The approved public school district serving as a Student Teacher Center and the college or university using its facilities shall jointly approve or select the supervising teachers, employees of the district, to serve in the program and adopt an agreed continuing in service improvement program for said supervising teachers.

Section 4. There shall be paid to the public school district serving as a Student Teacher Center the sum of Two Hundred Dollars ($200) for each supervising teacher, to be an additional increment for such additional services to the annual salary of each such supervising teacher. In addition there shall be paid to the district the sum of Fifty Dollars ($50) per each supervising teacher unable to assist in meeting the costs incurred in providing facilities for student teaching. This total, Two Hundred Fifty Dollars ($250) per supervising teacher, shall be paid from the Minimum Foundation Program Fund; this cost shall be considered by the Foundation School Fund Budget Committee in estimating the funds needed for Foundation School Program purposes. The total number of supervising teachers to receive the additional increment herein provided shall never exceed seventy percent (70%) of the total number of student teachers enrolled in the practice teaching program.

In 1969 and 1970 the Texas state legislature passed and made effective House Bill 240. It required that supervising teachers be paid for ten days in-service work.

The passage of SB 8 and HB 240 encouraged the colleges and universities and the school districts to collaborate in teacher education. Each supervising teacher was to be paid $200 as an additional increment and receive ten days of paid in-service education. The school district was to receive $50 for each supervising teacher, that money to be used to assist in meeting the costs of providing the necessary facilities for student teaching.

In June 1972 the new Texas Standards for Teacher Education and Certification were issued by the commissioner of education. The new standards were to set policy for the state, although they did not carry the force of law. For the purposes of this document, two characteristics of these standards are especially noteworthy. First, they required that all presently approved programs of teacher education be converted to competency/performance-based programs by September 1, 1977, and that a five year transition period to accomplish that end begin on September 1, 1972;[3] and second, that the immediate phasing in of competency/performance-based programs should be done in cooperation by the colleges and universities involved, the local education agencies, and the professional organizations.

The three major partners who were to collaborate in teacher education were thus the colleges/universities, the school districts and the professional associations. TCIES made it a requirement that the regional education service centers and the community also be represented on what came to be called the Local Cooperative Teacher Education Centers (LCTEC) in order to qualify for its funds.

---

[3] In 1975 the attorney general in Texas rendered the opinion that competency/performance-based teacher education could be one route toward certification, but not the sole route. Thus, the mandate for competency-based teacher education was rescinded.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

A. THE TOPIC OF THIS STUDY

Section B of the Introduction reviewed the events leading up to the selection of the topic of collaboration in Texas. The concept of collaboration seemed central to what TCIES was trying to accomplish and, thus, became the idea that would guide this study. The complexity of the topic and our own predilections suggested that on-site interviews be attempted. Time and resource contraints served to narrow the field of potential sites to five, the Local Cooperative Teacher Education Centers (LCTECs) in San Antonio, Dallas, West Texas, Houston and Fort Worth. The reasons for choosing these five sites and some programmatic information on them are presented in Section B below.

Based on ERC's experience with the Teacher Center program over the years, and with the Teacher Center results in Texas, an analysis of the term collaboration was attempted. Generic questions thought pertinent to organized collaborative efforts of any group were also posed. This work resulted in a set of interview topics around which each interviewer was free to frame whatever questions seemed appropriate to the context and individual being interviewed.

The topics, along with associated dimensions or explanatory questions, are listed below in order to give the reader a general impression of the kinds of issues pursued by the interviewers.

1. Queries on characteristics of advisory board at each site:

   Who are the council members? What are their names and affiliations?

   What are the bylaws? How are the sites governed and organized?

   What is the power structure? What are the legal or authorized responsibilities and duties?

   How are funds acquired? What are the dollar amounts, from what sources, for what purposes, and to whom are they allocated?

   What institutions are involved? How many, and what kind?

   What are the present activities? Where are they located?

   What are the executive resources?

   What are the executive roles?

   What is the central organizational structure?

   How many meetings are held? How well are they attended and what is their purpose?

2. Queries on relationship to other agencies, such as the education service centers, the Texas Education Agency, and TCIES:

   What is the hierarchical structure, both vertical and horizontal?

   What are the attitudes? How dependent or independent are they?

   How formal or informal are the linkages?

   What is the amount of overlap? Is there conflict with charges and responses of other bodies?

   What linkages exist between agencies regarding power structure and funding?

3. Queries on LCTEC's role and program:

   What is the official charge? What does each group represented think it should be?

   What does the LCTEC actually do? What does a particular representative group think it should do?

   What is each group represented attempting to do?

   What does each group represented want to cease doing?

   What does each group represented see as barriers or hindrances to what it wants to do?

   What does each group represented see as its strengths?

   What does each group represented see as factors/conditions favoring its position and interests?

What are the strengths/weaknesses of the LCTEC in the eyes of each member group?
What are the facilitating forces relative to what the LCTEC as a whole wants to do? What are the barriers?
How representative is the LCTEC?

4. Queries on the different histories and interests in education of each group represented:

What have they cooperated on?
What have they been in competition over or for?
In what ways have they seen each other as obstacles? as resources?
What have been areas of friction? What have been areas of dissatisfaction?
What are the perceived interests and hopes of each group in the development of the LCTEC?

5. Queries on collaboration which involve both giving and receiving:

What does each group represented think it gives to and gets from the LCTEC?
What does the LCTEC give to and get from the environment?
What is perceived to lie in LCTEC control? (It may be important to distinguish between legal authorized plan perceived and actual performance.)

6. Queries on communication patterns:

Who knows whom?
What are the formal/informal communication patterns among groups?
What happens at meetings?
Who attends meetings?
What topics are discussed?
What attitudes toward the meetings are expressed by individuals who attend them?

7. Queries on constraints on the LCTEC:

What procedures are followed?
What customs are observed?
What is the power structure?

B. THE FIVE LCTECs CHOSEN FOR THIS STUDY

As noted in Section B of the Introduction, five sites were selected for the 1974-75 evaluation study. They were: the Dallas Teacher Education Center, the Fort Worth Teacher Center, the Houston Teacher Center, the San Antonio Teacher Education Advisory Center, and the West Texas State University Teacher Center. These five sites were selected because (1) they were fully operational for at least two years; (2) they were involved in the long history of efforts to develop collaborative teacher education programs in Texas (TTT and TERC); and (3) descriptive documents and evaluation data for these sites were most readily available. Of course logistics and available resources also constrained the total number of sites that could be studied.

In 1973-74 each of the five LCTECs conducted a needs assessment of student and teacher needs (the Houston Needs Assessment model was used in most cases) and an operational plan based on the needs assessment was developed for each project. Many of the components or activities the projects employed were similar in that all five sites had (1) a CBTE effort in some stage of development; (2) awareness conferences and programs for use and adoption of proven products; (3) an internal evaluation component; (4) in-service training programs; and (5) an advisory board to allow for interinstitutional collaboration. Three sites, Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston, had an information/dissemination system utilizing the Texas Information Service (TIS), and two sites, Dallas and Houston, offered unique preservice education programs.

Data from the 1973-74 survey conducted to determine the installation and impact of Teacher Center projects showed some promising results:

- 83 percent of the clients of the Teacher Center projects were aware of the existence of the project;
- 60 percent of the administrators sampled had attended awareness conferences; and
- 80 percent of all educators surveyed in the five sites did participate in in-service training sponsored by the Teacher Center.

The five projects are both SB 8 and TCIES Teacher Centers. That means that they are a response to SB 8 requirements and are also qualified to receive TCIES funds. The activities mentioned above, however, are only those connected to their TCIES affiliation and do not include other activities supported by other sources.

C. PROCEDURES

Following the analysis presented in Section A above a comprehensive list of potential interviewees was drawn up, based on documentation available to ERC and containing the names of the members of the advisory boards or councils at each of the five Teacher Centers to be studied. A sample was drawn cutting across the different representatives at each site. A meeting was then scheduled with the director of TCIES, in order to review the sample, the interview guide and procedures, and to schedule the interviews. The interviews were conducted between May 14 and May 19, 1975.

Interviewers were assigned to locations in accordance with their familiarity with the sites and people, and scheduling and time constraints. The interviewers and their sites were Egon Guba, San Antonio and Austin; Jane Siegel, Houston and Fort Worth; and Andres Steinmetz, Dallas and West Texas.

Table 1 on the following page provides a graphic view of the number of individuals represented on each Teacher Center project's advisory body. The numerator in each cell shows the number of people interviewed while the denominator indicates the total number of that type of representative on the advisory body. Six of the eight members of the TCIES executive committee (of the project's twenty-eight member steering committee) were also interviewed. (Although some of these individuals were seen primarily in their roles as members of their respective LCTEC advisory boards, four of them were specifically interviewed about their role on and the nature of their collaboration with the TCIES executive committee.)

In the data collection process (the interviews) no attempt was made to describe comprehensively each LCTEC but just to comment on those aspects of the organization or operation which, at least on the face of it, seemed to represent collaborative activity or else were likely to hinder or facilitate it in some way. In addition, the same topics were not always covered in the same detail in each site. That inconsistency was a function of the compromise that had to be made in balancing the personalities of those interviewed, the local conditions and the themes dominating the lives of the individuals and the Teacher Center at the time of the interview

TABLE 1

Number of representatives interviewed May 14-15, 1975
for each institution out of total number of representatives on the Council.

LCTEC		MEMBERS REQUIRED BY THE REVISED STANDARDS			ADDITIONAL MEMBERS REQUIRED TO RECEIVE TCIES SUPPORT		OTHER		
		Members Required by Senate Bill 8		Professional Associations	Regional ESC	Community	Student Teachers	TEA	MEMBERS AT LARGE
		Colleges/ Universities	School Districts						
DALLAS		2/14	2/6	1/9	1/2	1/5	0/7	0/2	–
FT. WORTH*		2/6	2/2	0/2	1/1	1/2	–	–	–
HOUSTON*†	COUNCIL	2/20	1/20	2/20	0/2	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/5
	OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE	2/5	1/6	2/5	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0
SAN ANTONIO*		3/5	1/5	1/3	1/1	1/2	–	–	–
WEST TEXAS STATE UNIV.		1/4	1/3	1/3	1/1	1/3	–	–	0/1
TCIES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE		1/2	1/2	2/2	1/1	–	–	1/1	–

* In Ft. Worth, Houston and San Antonio a meeting of the Advisory Council was observed also.

† In Houston, a total of 7 people, 5 from the Operations Committee and 2 involved in collaborative activities, were interviewed.

against the stated purpose of the interview, namely, to study the nature and extent of collaborative activity at each site. Hence no particular significance should be attached to instances in which certain topics or issues are treated in more detail at one site than at another.

Finally, we recognize the value of maintaining a distinction between descriptive facts and interpretations based on those descriptive facts. The small number of events, people and amount of time in the life of each LCTEC sampled, however, has made for some impatience with a strict adherence to this important canon of field work. We also shared, as interviewers, the belief that we hold some responsibility to actively make use of our own feelings and experience in collecting and interpreting data--to offer impressions, observations, even suggestions. Thus we have readily moved back and forth between "data" and "interpretation" leaving it up to the persons involved in Texas to gauge our remarks against their own experience and hopefully derive some use from them.

CHAPTER 3

FINDINGS

A. CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS CHAPTER

It must be remembered that the basic interest guiding the interviews that formed the basis of this study was to understand the nature and extent of collaboration at each of the five Local Cooperative Teacher Education Centers (LCTEC) chosen. The topics presented and observations made were determined by this interest.[1]

The chapter outline itself represents a set of topics assumed to bear on collaborative activity in general. Each main topic appears as a section heading and each LCTEC is discussed separately relative to that heading. Occasionally some general remarks appear at the beginning of a section and are meant to apply to each of the LCTECs. Abbreviations are: SATEAC, San Antonio Teacher Education Advisory Council; DTEC, Dallas Teacher Education Center; WTTC, West Texas Teacher Center; HTC, Houston Teacher Center; and FWTC, Fort Worth Teacher Center.

B. LCTEC AUTHORITY, GOALS AND INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Authority As already noted in Chapter 1, Section B, SB 8 required that student teaching centers be set up to involve at least one university and one independent school district. The state board standards officially designate such centers as LCTECs and in addition require that the local professional association be involved in the governing structure. By virtue of its TCIES funding, an LCTEC is required to involve the regional Education Service Centers and the "community" in governance.

---

[1] Limitations important to the material found in this chapter are discussed in Chapter 2, Sections A and C.

The minimal operational requirements for an LCTEC is that it have a board consisting of some mix of representatives from the five groups involved in governance; that this board meet on some regular schedule; and that the board review, prior to submission to TEA for approval, any proposed, new, or altered teacher education programs developed by its college members.

SAN ANTONIO

Goals[2] The purpose of SATEAC is to coordinate staff development efforts and improve the quality of teacher training and classroom performance among colleges, universities, school districts, professional associations, and the Education Service Center of Region 20.

a. Constituencies Represented Five constituencies are involved in making up an advisory council of sixteen persons. The member institutions are: the five universities/colleges in the San Antonio area (three Roman Catholic institutions, Incarnate Word, Our Lady of the Lake, and Saint Mary's); one private independent institution with a residual relationship to the Presbyterian Church, Trinity College; and a new rapid-growing campus of the University of Texas, the University of Texas at San Antonio) each with one representative; thirteen of the fifteen independent school districts of San Antonio which are at any moment represented by five persons; the professional association (Texas State Teachers Association, Region 20) represented by three persons; the regional Education Service Center (Region 20) represented by one person; and the "community" represented by two persons.

---

[2] This goal statement was extracted from the SATEAC Constitution. More specific objectives have been prepared by SATEAC.

DALLAS

Goals[3] DTEC was established in order to provide more efficient educational personnel for an urban setting. Based on the assumption that no single institution or agency can prepare educational personnel, the Teacher Center is a cooperative effort of the Dallas Independent School District, area colleges and universities, an education service center, professional associations, and the community.

a. Constituencies Represented Six constituencies are involved, making up an advisory council of forty-five persons. The member institutions are: seven colleges or universities, each with two representatives (Bishop College, Dallas Baptist College, East Texas State University, North Texas State University, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical University, Southern Methodist University, Texas Women's University);

---

[3] This goal statement was extracted from a recent DTEC position paper. It also lists more specific objectives and functions.

the Dallas Independent School District, with six representatives including the directors of each of the four Area Teacher Centers; professional organizations with four representatives from the Classroom Teachers of Dallas, one from the Dallas Association of Paraprofessionals, and four from the Dallas School Administrator's Association; community and business organizations with five representatives; the Education Service Center for Region 10 with two representatives; the Texas Education Agency with two representatives, and student teachers with seven representatives.

WEST TEXAS

Goals[4] The WTTC is formed in order that each member may have an opportunity to share cooperatively in the design of preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Members are the Amarillo, Canyon and Hereford Independent School Districts; West Texas State University; the Amarillo, Canyon and Hereford Classroom Teachers Association; Region 16 Education Service Center; community parent groups; Amarillo College and representatives at large.

a. Constituencies Represented Five constituencies are involved, making up an advisory council of fifteen persons. The member institutions are: West Texas State University with three representatives; Amarillo College, one representative; Amarillo, Canyon and Hereford ISDs, one representative each; the Classroom Teachers Association, one representative from each district; the Region 16 Education Service Center, one representative; the community, with one representative from each district; and the public at large, one representative.

---

[4] This goal statement was extracted from the WTTC bylaws. More specific objectives have been prepared by the WTTC.

HOUSTON

Goals[5] The major purpose of the Houston Teacher Center is to improve the education of youth through improved education of those persons working with them in the schools. The center advises the university, member school districts, and professional associations on matters regarding teacher education, and recommends programs and procedures for improving preparation programs.

a. Constituencies Represented Several constituencies make up a council of seventy members. They are the University of Houston with twenty representatives; twenty different school districts with one or more representatives each; twenty professional organizations with a total of twenty representatives; the regional Education Service Center, two representatives; the Texas Education Agency, one representative; and at least five other organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce or school board which may send one representative each.

From this large membership an Operations Committee is elected. Its eighteen members included five representatives of the University of Houston; six from the different school districts; one each from five professional organizations; one from the community and one student teacher representative. The Operations Committee, not the council, will be the advisory body described and discussed in this report.

---

[5] This goal statement waa extracted from the 1974-75 revised proposal for the Teacher Center project.

FORT WORTH

Goals[6] The major goal of the FWTC is to design and operate a model Teacher Center. It intends to do that through such activities as maintaining a resource center, developing a management system, facilitating the use of proven products, and conducting in-service meetings.

a. Constituencies Represented Five constituencies are involved, making up an advisory council of thirteen persons. Members are the Fort Worth school district, two representatives; the regional ESC, one representative; the Fort Worth School Administrator's Association and the Fort Worth Classroom Teachers Association, one representative each; six different universities, one representative each; and the community, two representatives.

Summary of Advisory Council Membership at Each LCTEC Table 2 on the following page summarizes the advisory council membership at each local Teacher Center visited. The numerator in each cell shows the total number of representatives from a given institution and the denominator shows the total number of institutions or organizations of a given kind taking part in Teacher Center activity.

---

[6] This goal statement was extracted from the First Quarterly Report, FY 75, of the Fort Worth Teacher Center.

TABLE 2

Summary of Advisory Council Membership at Each LCTEC*

LCTEC		MEMBERS REQUIRED BY THE REVISED STANDARDS			ADDITIONAL MEMBERS REQUIRED TO RECEIVE TCIES SUPPORT		OTHER			TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNCIL MEMBERS
		Members Required by Senate Bill 8		Professional Associations	Regional ESC	Community	Student Teachers	TEA	MEMBERS AT LARGE	
		Colleges/ Universities	School Districts							
DALLAS		14/7	6/1	9/3	2	5	7	2		45
FT. WORTH		6/6	2/1	2/2	1	2				13
HOUSTON	COUNCIL	20/1	20/20	20/19	2/1	1	2/2	1	4	70
	OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE	5/1	6/6	5/5	0/0	1	1			18
SAN ANTONIO		5/5	5/13	3/1	1	2				16
WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY		4/2	3/3	3/1	1	3			1	15

*Each cell shows the total number of representatives per total number of institutions or organizations involved.

Note: Entries in each cell are not always comparable. For example, one LCTEC might list under "other" someone a different LCTEC might list under business or community representatives.

C. BYLAWS AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

SAN ANTONIO

The organization of SATEAC is quite simple, consisting of the planning committee of sixteen members with an elected chairman and vice chairman, and one of its members, the ESC representative, designated as executive officer for a three year term. In general, SATEAC is a loose confederation. Its decisions are not binding on its members without their separate ratification. University members are specifically exempted in the constitution from being bound by program decisions or recommendations.

The present organization of SATEAC can best be understood in historical context. One of its charter representatives from a university described it as follows. About four years ago it became apparent that student teacher centers would be mandated in Texas. The San Antonio area colleges and school districts were concerned that such centers should not simply proliferate as they might well do in San Antonio with its (then) four colleges and fifteen school districts, if each center were to involve only one college and one school district. There would be enormous waste if each college had to maintain a separate board for each school district. At the same time it was felt that various sources of federal money for Teacher Centers or renewal centers would become available. In order to protect themselves against useless proliferation as well as to be in a convenient posture to apply for funds, SATEAC was formed prior to the enactment of Senate Bill 8 with membership from all five constituencies. The group never saw itself as an operating entity but, according to the persons interviewed, as an executive council, a clearinghouse, a loose coalition, or an umbrella organization. It wished to be and to remain in a flexible posture to accomodate and to exploit whatever developments that would occur.

This essential structure exists at the present time. The SATEAC has not come to grips with its organizational problems as these have emerged, or with the realities that have since become clear--that there would be no federal funds for renewal centers, for example. SATEAC was designed as a precursor organization but the body into which it was to metamorphose did not grow.

When a decision on leadership for the Teacher Center needed to be made most of the member agencies wanted the SATEAC site and executive officer to be on "neutral ground." This seemed to be especially true of the universities, none of which wanted the other universities to have precedence. Apparently the most neutral ground was the Education Service Center and, it is claimed, it was this consideration that led to the designation of the ESC director as executive officer.

SATEAC remains essentially undefined organizationally. The Teacher Center concept is not yet clear (one respondent described it as a "conceptual fog") and cannot serve, it is said, as a unifying theme. Another respondent characterized it as an "unholy alliance" in which the universities agree to participate solely to protect their interests and to put themselves in line for whatever funds might be forthcoming. Now that it is apparent that program review is largely pro forma (hence not too threatening) and that federal funds are not available, there seems to be little stimulus for further organizational development.

DALLAS

The DTEC underwent a reorganization in 1974. The Dallas Independent School District was divided into four areas, and one Area Teacher Center was established in each. Each ATC has a full time director but there is also an executive director who coordinates the activities and the programs of the larger structure called the Dallas Teacher Education Center, which includes the four area Teacher Centers. The executive director is the assistant superintendent for personnel development in the Dallas Independent School District. As a current DTEC position paper put it, the personnel development arm of the Dallas school district supervises the operations of the Teacher Center and all persons interviewed more or less agreed that the Dallas school district was the dominant member of the council. The school district acts as the main funding source and pays the salaries of key persons such as those of the ATC directors.

Since 1969 the directorship of DTEC has changed almost yearly. The current director is the fifth person to occupy that position since 1969 and this has created a certain lack of continuity from year to year. However, the director in 1972-73, though not now formally a member of the advisory council, continues to remain associated with DTEC as a consultant/special assistant director of the competency-based teacher education project.

The desicion to decentralize into four Area Teacher Centers was made by the superintendent of the Dallas school district. The idea, apparently, as is usually the case with efforts at decentralization, was to bring the locus of decision making closer to the decision situations. At least one respondent, however, maintained that the benefits of decentralization are outweighed by its disadvantages--that the move to decentralize will hinder the informal interaction among members that is so important in fostering cooperative activity among different institutions. Indeed, one theme stressed by more than half of the persons interviewed was that informal interaction among advisory council members had been essential to the spirit of cooperation so far achieved.

In addition to its full time director, each Area Teacher Center has a staff of master teachers available to call on and work with preservice and in-service personnel. A DTEC position paper notes that there are about fifteen college/university professors distributed on a full time basis across the four centers. Their salaries are paid in part by the school district utilizing TCIES funds.

The major thrusts of the Teacher Center and the personnel development department of the school district are carried out through the work of each Area Teacher Center. In addition to responding to requests from local schools, eachArea Teacher Center is identified with a certain thrust: Area 1 with refining the assumptions underlying competency-based teacher education and developing an instructional strategy which may be used to further the acquisition of teacher competencies; Area 2 with developing a management plan; Area 3 with strategies for the verification of teacher competencies; and Area 4 with the formulation of assessment techniques, applicable to preservice education, which would help determine the extent to which student teachers have acquired certain competencies. Although student teachers have usually worked under the aegis of one given Area Teacher Center, the hope is that next year it will be possible to expose at least some of the student teachers to each Area Teacher Center.

The advisory council is divided into eight working committees. All advisory council members serve on at least one committee. The committees are Staff Development, Special Education, Preservice Education, Paraprofessional, Counselor Education, Career Education, Administration/Supervision, and Organization. The Organization Committee is made up of council officers and the chairpersons of the other committees. There are also approximately twenty-seven other persons who serve on these committees but who are not council members. Each committee prepares and makes programmatic recommendations to the center council in its area of emphasis.

Other council officers are the executive director, already mentioned, who is designated by the superintendent of schools, a vice chairperson elected by the council from its membership, and a secretary also appointed by the superintendent. The secretary, along with an assistant, serves as the operations director of the center. Both the operations director and his assistant are nonvoting members of the council. The executive director of the center also acts as chairperson of the council.

The organization and structure of the Teacher Center are not clear to all of the persons interviewed. The rationale for decentralization was apparently never publicly explained to the advisory council as a whole and the frequent top echelon changes have created some confusion, or, as one person put it, much "spinning of wheels." One problem noted in particular had to do with the role and effectiveness of the council committees. Not all respondents were familiar with what those committees they were not serving on were doing and what their assigned tasks were. Nor were all respondents able to articulate how the work of each committee was tied to the goals of the center. Some respondents felt that as long as recommendations made by the committee did not require major policy decisions, it was easy to have them brought before the council and approved, but that when they did address policy they could not comfortably be brought before the council. For example, a year ago the Paraprofessional Committee developed a plan and a set of recommendations, but for some unclear reason it was never brought before the council. The chairperson of that committee resigned, apparently partly because of the frustrations involved.

The recently formed Organization Committee has set itself the task of clarifying what topics or issues need committees and what the official task of each committee should be. As a first step, the Organization Committee recommended in January 1975 that each committee prepare a statement on its functions for presentation to the council in May 1975, and that recommendation was approved.

Part of the confusion surrounding the work and role of any given committee may be related to how closely it touches dominant themes occupying the council. Though dealing with no less important problems, the Paraprofessional Committee may simply be overshadowed by the preservice and in-service concerns that dominate much of present Teacher Center thought. To consider how paraprofessionals might enter the picture when the place of teachers in teacher education is not clear may be too much to handle at once. Some committees, however, are obviously productive. The Preservice Committee, for example, has designed an application form to be used by student teachers, and made up the cooperative agreement between the universities and the school district. It has also recently expanded its membership, and its work has clearly helped to clarify and strengthen the relationship between the universities and the schools. Nevertheless, reading the minutes of the past year leaves the impression that the council is still in the process of resolving some basic organizational issues.

WEST TEXAS

The central and most visible personalities in the WTTC have known each other and worked together for many years. The present director of the center was dean of the College of Education at West Texas State University in 1969. The present dean preceded him as center director. A previous interim dean had been associated with Teacher Centers in Texas since their inception and in conjunction with the present WTTC director, started Panhandle Educational Services Organization--the prototype of the education service centers--in 1965. Thus, in one way or another, these individuals have worked together at least since 1969, the year a TTT grant called for cooperation among the university, the school districts, and the education service center. The TTT effort gradually merged into what is now called the Teacher Center as grants became more categorical.

Originally, the bylaws of WTTC required the director of the center to be the dean of the school of education. This was changed in April 1975 so that now a director is elected from the membership of the advisory council for a two year term. One respondent said this change represents the belief that in a cooperative endeavor anyone should be able to become the director. However, another respondent said that the change in the bylaws and probably also the actual selection of the director was determined by political conveniences and circumstances. Recently some top management shifts have been made at West Texas State University and, in the opinion of some of those interviewed, this las led to some changes affecting the collaborative efforts of the center. For example, the education service center has traditionally taught a number of courses for which teachers received credit at the university. Some respondents said that now it is becoming increasingly difficult for teachers to obtain credit for such work from the university. This may decrease the field-based teacher education options available to all teachers.

The council's executive committee is presided over by the chairman of the council, and is composed of the center director, one representative of the administration of each school district (which happens to be the superintendent in each case), the dean of the collge of education at West Texas State University, the officers of the council (director, chairman, vice chairman and secretary) and one representative each from the Classroom Teachers Association and the Region 16 Education Service Center.

HOUSTON

The advisory board is made up of an eighteen member Operations Committee, all members of the larger council, which is responsible for five major functions: (1) advising the University of Houston on teacher education/certification programs; (2) proposing Teacher Center policy to the larger council; (3) recommending criteria for the selection of supervising teachers; (4) placing student teachers with supervising teachers; and (5) in-service education for supervising teachers. The committee is also expected to act on center matters between the biannual meetings of the council. The bylaws were developed by the Operations Committee and were revised and approved by the council in January 1975. According to members of the committee .it is they who actually carry out the purposes of the project.

The council itself is responsible for maintaining essential communications and participation among members, making recommendations for improving teacher education, and establishing general center policies.

Each school district represented on the advisory board has a coordinating committee which varies in size from one school district to another; members do not necessarily sit on the council. Each of these committees, while subject to the administrative policies and procedures of its district, is responsible for the operations of the Teacher Center's program in its district. Responsibilities include keeping the school district and professional organizations informed on the nature of the preparation programs at the University of Houston, planning in-service programs and encouraging participation, recommending settings for the placement of student teachers, planning and implementing the use of SB 8 funds, preparing recommendations concerning the student-teaching program and other field experiences, and coordinating the center with other centers that might exist in the school district.

The bylaws also permit the council to appoint adhoc committees.

FORT WORTH

The bylaws of this project were developed and agreed on when the project was located at Texas Christian University in 1971-73. The nature of the project, the composition of the advisory board, and roles and functions have changed to the extent that the current members plan to rewrite the constitution and bylaws of the project, although no time schedule has been set. The advisory body includes representatives of all constituencies required by SB 8, the Revised Standards, and TCIES.

As is the case with many other local Teacher Centers, what is now the Fort Worth Teacher Center was originally a TTT site, and later a TERC site. Up to 1973-74 the grantee was Texas Christian University but then the Fort Worth school district assumed this function. These changes have simply not yet found their way into the formal bylaws.

The center director serves as chairman of the advisory council and as a member of the TCIES executive committee. He seems to serve as the administrator and planner of center efforts, and communicates regularly with center personnel and advisory council members. In addition to the director, there is also a coordinator and part time evaluator. Committees are formed as necessary, but at present there is just one standing committee, the Committee for the Development of Professional Competencies in Teaching.

Four Teacher Center sites are operated by the Fort Worth project, each occupying some space in a different school. These locations house resource material and provide facilities for in-service training and meetings for supervising teachers and university faculty.

D. MEETINGS: NUMBER, ATTENDANCE AND PURPOSE

SAN ANTONIO

The SATEAC board meets quarterly but special meetings can be called, such as the one scheduled for June 1975 for self evaluation of the advisory body. Attendance at meetings varies according to the different groups making up the advisory council. The education service center representative always attends and the five university representatives attend almost every session. School district attendance has been spotty. Of the three representatives of the Texas State Teachers Association, only two attend regularly. The community members pair; the PTA representative is almost always present while the school board representative is almost always absent.

The only mandated purpose for these meetings is that of program review. Regular meetings seem to be divided into several topics, including sharing of individual information and experiences, program review, program description (the colleges taking turns in describing their teacher education programs), organization development (self evaluation, for example, and discussions of ongoing activities, such as a needs assessment program).

DALLAS

Four council meetings were held for the 1974-75 school year, with slightly more than half of the total of forty-five members and from eight to twenty-four visitors in attendance at three of the four meetings. Committees are expected to meet as necessary. Although no data on the frequency of committee meetings were available, council minutes show that most of the committees have met at least once. The colleges and universities are always well-represented, as is the Dallas school district. Only one of the three professional organizations represented missed two of the three meetings for which attendance data were available. Of five different agencies representing the community and business, three missed two or three of the three meetings. Student teachers are always well-represented.

In this as in the other Teacher Centers the council serves the function of reviewing preservice programs. Council minutes from three of the four meetings show the following kinds of business: election of officers, scheduling of future meetings, review of a committee report on a cooperative agreement between the university and the school district, authorization for committees to proceed with certain work (such as the development of a due process procedure for student teachers by the preservice committee), discussion of a committee report on guidelines covering the admission of new members to the council, reports on conferences attended, reports on progress with competency-based teacher education, matters of internal organization such as the formation of new standing committees, reports from standing committees, and discussion of a committee report on policies and procedures governing the preservice teaching program. Two of the meetings were one hour long and one lasted an hour and a half.

WEST TEXAS

During the time interval January 1974 - April 1975 the advisory council met three times, only twice during the 1974-75 school year. The executive committee is said to have met about as often, usually just prior to the council meeting.

Attendance varied from six to ten members out of a total of fifteen. At least one representative from each of the major partners was always present.

Minutes of the three meetings showed them to be devoted to the following kinds of topics: revision of the bylaws, approving the submission of proposals (to establish a bilingual education program, for example, and an evaluation system for competency-based teacher education graduates, discussion of the feasibility of at least a temporary expansion of Teacher Center activities to include additional school districts, discussion of certification programs at the university, discussion of new degree programs, and election of officers. The meetings appeared to last about an hour.

HOUSTON

The full council meets twice a year, the last meeting having been held in January 1975. The Operations Committee meets once each month or as needed; although a meeting of the committee had been held early in May, a second one was scheduled for mid-May to discuss several pressing matters that had arisen prior to the end of the school year.

According to the bylaws the coordinating committees in each school district are supposed to meet as needed with a minimum of once per semester. No formal attendance data for the meetings of the advisory board or different committees were collected. One Operations Committee meeting was observed in which thirteen of eighteen members were present. Also the executive officer stated that attendance is generally good at board and Operations Committee meetings.

FORT WORTH

Meetings are generally held monthly and also as needed. In May 1975, for example, there were meetings two weeks in a row so that a newly-prepared special document on the development of professional competency in teaching could be carefully reviewed.

A sample of minutes of past meetings show that eight or nine of the thirteen members, if not more, generally attend. Communication about these meetings is said to have improved since the current Teacher Center director took office. According to one respondent, advisory council members had not previously been given sufficient notice as to dates, times and locations.

Meetings of the advisory council are devoted to fulfilling the mandated functions of SB 8 and TCIES. Members discuss and review such topics as Teacher Center expenditures, new preservice teacher preparation programs from member universities, and new program ideas for in-service training. The original Teacher Center project was to develop a competency-based teacher education program and this still seems to be the intent of advisory council members, some of whom are strong representatives on the council's Committee for the Development of Professional Competence in Teaching. Other meeting purposes suggested by those interviewed were "for public relations purposes--to be seen by the educational community as being cooperative, interested," and "Teacher Center meetings and activity make people work together...on student teaching and that's important...but it's also secondary--the long range need is to upgrade skills of in-service teachers and the way to begin is to work with the supervising teachers."

E. EXECUTIVE RESOURCES AND ROLES

SAN ANTONIO

The executive director of Region 20 Education Service Center, who is also the director of SATEAC, devoted as much time as possible to SATEAC administration. This time, however, is not reimbursed but is taken from his Region 20 time and resources. In addition, the education service center provides in-kind support in the form of meeting space, secretarial help and materials, as needed by the Teacher Center project. TCIES funds are used to support a small portion of staff time on the Needs Assessment Project (both education service center personnel and outside consultants) and computer time.

The board has a chairman and vice chairman but their roles are pro forma and apparently are limited to chairing board meetings. The executive officer of SATEAC attempts to be the implementer of SATEAC board action decisions. In this regard he is sometimes perceived as overstepping the bounds of his delegated authority. For example, after the board had reached consensus to proceed with the needs assessment project, the executive officer solicited TCIES funds and support, hired outside consultants, and approved their design. At the next board meeting the design was promptly challenged on the grounds that the board had not approved these action steps. While the Needs Assessment Project proceeds apace, the issues raised by the decisive action on the part of the executive officer remain both unsettled and unsettling. A second example is found in his decision to submit to the Texas Education Agency excerpts of board minutes dealing with particular program reviews. One university member viewed this action as "unauthorized and unwarranted" intervention in a university-Texas Education Agency negotiation and may demand officially that this practice cease.

DALLAS

As already noted, the executive director of the Dallas Teacher Education Center (who is also the assistant superintendent for personnel development in the Dallas school district) acts as chairperson of the council. He is appointed by the superintendent of schools, as is the secretary of the council. According to the bylaws, the secretary, along with his assistant, serves as the operations director of the Teacher Center. The secretary transcribes minutes of the meetings, reproduces materials, and distributes agendas of meetings. He is available to prepare the minutes of committee meetings although some committees do that on their own.

It seems that the Dallas school board sets policy and that the council serves in an advisory capacity. All respondents would probably agree that the school district, while it may consider the input from the council, nevertheless determines the focus of the Teacher Center. Two respondents pointed out that the procedure for the appointment of the director of the Teacher Center was never subjected to debate at a council meeting. Rather, it simply appeared in the bylaws. One respondent, while agreeing that the council is not a rubber-stamp, nevertheless stressed that it did not seem to be as autonomous as it was some years ago. Both respondents associated the loss of autonomy with the decentralization into four Teacher Centers and with the school system's increasing executive control. One person felt that when the Teacher Center first began, its director was "chosen" by the school administration and the council. This first procedure changed to one in which the superintendent suggested who should be named director then to the present state of affairs in which the school district simply makes the appointment. Apparently the council also had no input into the selection of the Area Teacher Centers or their directors. In that sense, then, executive control is seen to rest firmly in the hands of the Dallas school district.

The Teacher Center has a secretary available to help out with logistical problems, but three respondents stressed the need for greater and more efficient executive resources. There was some confusion on this point, however, since it was not always possible to distinguish between the personnel needs of the larger Teacher Center as opposed to those of the Area Teacher Centers. In any case, the need to strengthen two executive roles--implementers and coordinators--was stressed. As implementers, personnel is needed to carry out ideas or activities formulated at the Area Teacher Centers or in committee. There is also the need to find better ways of making what happens at council meetings known to the constituents of the different groups represented. Whether or not this happens, and how well it is done, seems at present to depend entirely on the limited energies of the individual representatives themselves. (Whether or not representatives are chosen with this latter function in mind was not known by the respondents.) As coordinators, personnel is needed to strengthen meeting procedures and communications among council members. For example, a meeting room must be prepared, announcements of meetings and agendas must be sent out in time, and sufficient parking places must be available on meeting dates.

WEST TEXAS

The executive committee meets separately from the advisory council; it considers recommendations and other administrative matters to be brought before the advisory council. One respondent described the executive committee as a "sounding board" for issues later presented to the large group. It was asserted that most decisions are made at the executive committee level and then, at the advisory council meetings, merely discussed further and ratified.

The structure of the executive committee and its role in decision making clearly place community and business representatives in a reactive role. One respondent pointed out that the situation prevents these representatives from grasping fully the issues involved, and, consequently, their proper and called-for involvement must wait until the major partners have settled their differences. All respondents would probably agree that the input of teachers, the community, and business is not as great as it should be, or as one person said, as it will be.

It appears that both the college of education and the education service center are relied upon for executive resources such as space, telephone, secretarial time, and logistics support.

HOUSTON

The bylaws call for the University of Houston to "assume initiative in developing and improving teacher education and Teacher Center operation." The executive officer or director of the Teacher Center is selected by the University of Houston. He fills several roles, including those of project administrator, project spokesman (for lay and professional public relations), and proposal writer. He delivers technical assistance to area school districts, such as in program planning or needs assessment, and, in addition, serves as an associate dean of the College of Education at the University of Houston. His two secretaries assume the secretarial burdens associated with the Teacher Center. The University of Houston provides meeting space for the Teacher Center project. About one-fourth of the faculty of the College of Education at the University of Houston are involved in the Teacher Center in some way, e.g., coordinating field-based training or in meeting the needs of the Houston schools.

FORT WORTH

The present director of the Teacher Center assumed his position in March 1974. He also serves as director of teacher education for the Fort Worth school district, as chairman of the Teacher Center advisory council, and is on the TCIES executive committee. One of his predecessors also served on the advisory council. The part time project evaluator, from the same university, frequently attends advisory council meetings. Although these people do not carry official executive roles, their influence over their university colleagues was noted and they appeared to form a kind of university executive committee of the council.

There is also a Teacher Center coordinator, referred to as the executive officer in some documents, who serves as secretary to the advisory council and carries out the day-to-day communications and operations for the project. In addition to her Teacher Center functions, she is an individually-guided education facilitator, and she has been involved in different capacities in elementary and secondary schools in Fort Worth and other school districts throughout the state that have adopted this individualized education program.

Executive resources are drawn from SB 8 and TCIES funds. There is a full time secretary at the Elder site, which is used for Teacher Center activities. In addition, the project director's secretary also does Teacher Center work. The education service center shares equipment, materials, and personnel with the Teacher Center.

F. FUNDS

The mandates establishing local cooperative teacher education centers--SB 8, HR 240, the Revised Standards, and TCIES--provided limited support for the operation of the Teacher Center efforts. SB 8 ensures that a school district participating in a local Teacher Center will receive $250 per student teacher placed in that independent school district. Of this sum, however, $200 is earmarked as a salary increment to the supervising teacher. The remaining $50 is for use by the school district to meet the costs incurred in providing such things as facilities for student teaching. The Revised Standards do not involve any funds and TCIES support comes as a result of a proposal submission and review process.

None of the mandates establishing local Teacher Centers provided for operating or maintenance funds of any size; it was apparently assumed that the costs of operating local Teacher Centers would be met by off set funds from current expenditures. But this procedure does not account for board expenses and overhead, the need to maintain a central office or administrative and staff support, postage, or telephone. Several sites have taken action to meet their needs. The Fort Worth Teacher Center, for example, receives support for its local Teacher Center facility through its Elder site and the salaries of the project coordinator and secretary come from TCIES funds; the Houston Teacher Center has voted to establish a special account into which will flow 60 percent of the $50 per student teacher allocated each school district as a result of

SB 8 requirements, which is expected to amount to about $30,000 per year in operational funds.

SAN ANTONIO

It is immediately evident that SATEAC has no sources of core operational support, although it does have about $20,000 of TCIES funds for the 1974-75 year. These funds are designated for what may be the only current program activity: the student needs assessment project. A portion of these funds pays the half-time salary of an education service center staff member (who devotes most of this half-time to the needs assessment project) and also provides assistance to the executive officer. It seems likely that the Teacher Center will submit a proposal to TCIES for some funds for fiscal year 1976, but the nature of the proposal was not clear at the time the interviews were conducted.

The lack of core operational support may well be setting up an important executive imbalance. At SATEAC extra leverage has gone to whatever agency wished to and was in a position to provide operational resources, in this case, the education service center. While the board members may well be gratified by the education service center's willingness to assume this burden, they probably also feel at a disadvantage to the center because of it. It was impossible for the executive officer to provide an estimate of the actual costs incurred by the Region 20 Education Service Center in support of SATEAC, but indications are that the costs are sizeable.

DALLAS

DTEC's funds are drawn from state and federal grants or projects or from local (school district) general operating funds. The sources for 1974-75 are: TCIES, $53,285; Emergency School Aid, $255,116; Student Teacher Project, $105,250; Title I ESEA, $184,139; Career Opportunities Program, $31,588; and local (i.e., school district), $209,100 for a total budget of $838,478. In each case, between 88 and 96 percent of the funds are expended on personnel: one assistant superintendent, four Area Teacher Center directors, two secretaries, six half-time university coordinators, twenty-one resource teachers, three coordinators, 421 supervising teachers, one specialist, one consultant, and nine clerical staff. The balance is expended on instructional services, supplies/ materials, and contracted services.

When asked what major constraints hampered the operation of the Teacher Center, most respondents immediately referred to the lack of resources, especially money. For example, budgetary constraints in Dallas are making Teacher Center members wonder whether the "district is going to keep all of us." Since further support from TCIES was considered slim around the time of the interviews, it was questionable whether funds would be available to support the work of faculty members in the school system, an essential part of the collaborative effort. Some respondents saw this as a test of the universities' commitment to Teacher Centers, for many universities had not yet committed their own resources to the idea. Thus, in this view, if little or no outside money becomes available, universities will have to pay professors out of their own budgets to work in the schools, a condition which will, indeed, test their commitment.

WEST TEXAS

The lack of a stable financial base for the Teacher Center was identified as one of its major constraints by most of those interviewed. Whatever money is available comes through grant proposals, a condition which, it has been noted, sometimes restricts autonomy. One solution offered was that the Teacher Center get state funds or be put on a special formula similar to the one used for the education service centers.

The only funds expended by the WTTC in 1974-75 were those received from TCIES--about $24,000. That money was used to support some of the activity of the Humanistic Approach Project and a follow-up evaluation of students that completed their teacher education program at the university.

HOUSTON

Funds for 1974-75 for this local Teacher Center came from the Houston Independent School District, the University of Houston, TCIES, and the new special Teacher Center account described previously. The proposed 1974-75 budget called for provision of $11,387 by the Houston school district, almost $3,000 of which was continuation funds from 1973-74. The University of Houston provided $24,787. The TCIES funds available for 1974-75 through the Teacher Center project were $42,602, of which $30,518 were continuation funds from 1973-74.[7]

For 1974-75 the total Teacher Center budget will approach $78,746. The Teacher Center budget notes for 1974-75 indicate that there are many in-kind contributions and other resources being allocated by the cooperating school districts and the University of Houston. The amount of support generated through the new special Teacher Center account was not included in the 1974-75 budget.

FORT WORTH

In 1974-75 the Fort Worth Teacher Center received funds from the Fort Worth Independent School District, from one of the six participating institutions of higher education, from the Region 11 Education Service Center and from TCIES.

The Fort Worth school district contributed $17,400, and Texas Christian University supplied $14,544. Of the remaining five universities participating in the local Teacher Center, three--North Texas State University, Texas Women's University, and Texas Wesleyan College--made tentative commitments to provide $3,500, $6,000, and $3,840, respectively, to the local Teacher Center. This $13,340 is to be negotiated with the universities. The Region 11 Education Service Center provided $2,000 for the Teacher Center effort and TCIES granted the Fort Worth Teacher Center $28,080. In addition to the 1974-75 TCIES funds, the project had an additional $12,677 in carryover funds from TCIES, so that the total contribution of TCIES was $40,757. If all university budgets were committed, the total operating budget for the Fort Worth Teacher Center would be $85,561 in 1974-75.

---

[7] Due to prolonged negotiations with the Office of Education regional office, TCIES, and the University of Houston, it appears that not all of the $42,602 will be received by the project during 1974-75.

The balance of power or influence on the Teacher Center advisory council may be directly related to the differences in levels of support provided by member universities to the project. As noted previously, some university representatives indicated that Texas Christian University has a strong role on the council. As this university supplies about one-fourth of the nonfederal budget for the project, it seems logical that this funding situation affects the roles and relationships of council members.

G. PHYSICAL FACILITIES

SAN ANTONIO

There is no SATEAC site or set of physical facilities. Board meetings, which represent the only assemblage of SATEAC personnel, are held in the conference room of the education service center. Some suggestions have been made that the meeting place be rotated among the various member institutions but no formal action in support of this notion has been taken.

DALLAS

The DTEC is located in the personnel development resource center, which is part of North Dallas High School. This building is a large one-room structure separated from the high school and subdivided into offices and storage space for curriculum resource materials. An open area contains chairs and tables, and is used for advisory council meetings.

The Teacher Centers for Areas 1, 2, and 3 also have a definite location, each one being part of a different elementary school. The Teacher Center for Area 4 is located in a community learning center.

WEST TEXAS

There is no particular site or facility for this Teacher Center either. Meetings of the advisory board are held in different locations at West Texas State University. Presumably the service center is also used when necessary.

HOUSTON

The offices of the Teacher Center director and his secretarial staff are located on the fourth floor of the College of Education at the University of Houston. These offices occupy approximately one-fourth of the entire floor of this contemporary building. The carpeted, open space area set off by partial dividers, is shared with other organized activities such as a Teacher Corps competency-based teacher education project. Teacher Center activities also take place at other offices and meeting rooms at the University of Houston and at a school building in the Yates pyramid of schools (called the MacGregor Center).

FORT WORTH

There is a large portable classroom adjacent to the Elder elementary school, which is part of the original pyramid of schools served by the project. It houses the Teacher Center coordinator and her secretary and is used for such activities as meetings and workshops. The director's office, however, is in the central administration building of the Fort Worth school district.

Three additional sites for Teacher Center activity are located in Fort Worth schools. In each case a classroom has been turned over to the center; it is used to store materials, and for in-service and preservice seminars.

H. SELECTION, TENURE, ORIENTATION AND RESOURCES OF MEMBERS

SAN ANTONIO

Selection No specific data on the selection mechanism for members were obtained. The rule seems to be that members are selected and appointed by the agencies they represent. The colleges send their education deans or department chairmen; school districts send their superintendents or associate superintendents for curriculum and instruction, apparently with some kind of rotation to spread the five slots among the thirteen districts. The education service center sends its executive director, and the PTA and the County School Board Association select community representatives by their own criteria. The professional representatives are nominated by the Texas State Teachers Association; in 1975 they elected to send a classroom teacher, a superintendent, and a dean of boys.

Tenure There seem to be no fixed rules on tenure. Operationally, there is turnover in all except the university representation sometimes on an annual basis. This has given the universities an advantage in accumulated experience.

Orientation There is no formal orientation to the work of the board, although several members noted that much meeting time is devoted to program description for the sake of uninformed members. TCIES funds have been used to take the board to an exemplary Teacher Center operation in West Virginia. It was felt that this trip made a considerable contribution to the board's thinking.

Resources No resources are available from the member groups except such time as the individual representatives can and will devote to SATEAC affairs. The education service center, as has been noted, does provide core operational support for SATEAC.

DALLAS

Selection The bylaws state that institutional membership will be continuous and that participating institutions will select their own representatives. They also direct the council to select community organizations each year and invite those selected to choose their own representatives.

This wording seems to make a distinction in status between the community organizations and the other members of the council. One person interviewed asserted that the school district had in fact selected the organizations which were to serve on the council, and the council then simply accepted them. In at least one case, a member of a community/business organization was approached and asked to serve on the council as a representative of that organization. In this one situation at least, the organization did not choose its own representative. It was said that there were specific reasons for having chosen each of the community/ business organizations for membership on the council. The police department, for example, was selected because of its close association with the alternative schools.

Another respondent asserted that the chairperson of one of the committees was somehow appointed to that position even before having joined the committee. It was also reported that the presidents of professional associations are automatic members of the council but that they may appoint others to serve in their place. One respondent was not sure whether the chairperson of the council was elected or appointed to the position. Some respondents were not able to articulate any specific criteria for the selection of any of the members, but others said that it was clear that the school district wanted to have members on the council who would speak their minds and push for what they believe. It thus appears that there is an informal selection and appointment mechanism operating in addition to the formal one. Probably in an effort to clarify the matter, one of the council committees has recently worked up a set of criteria and guidelines covering the admission of new members.

Tenure One respondent noted that there has been a fair amount of change in council membership but that a nucleus of members has remained. The university membership has perhaps been the most consistent. The membership of the professional associations is said to change relatively frequently as their presidents change. The decentralization to four Area Teacher Centers and the frequent change of center directors has also caused an instability in the key school district membership.

Orientation No formal orientation appears to be given to council members but the hand-picking of many of the members suggests that they are informed about the activities and purposes of the council. In preparation for the 1974-75 activities the director of the center and others visited the schools of education of surrounding colleges and universities in order to explain the center and obtain interest and support.

Systematic or routine orientation of members may be needed, however. One respondent emphasized that "people don't believe their input is really wanted," and a thorough orientation to their role might constructively deal with such beliefs. Some impatience was expressed with people who "still don't understand." While it was felt that member organizations "do their homework" there seem to be distinct differences in level of awareness among different members.

Resources An interesting and valuable resource is the cross-institutional experience brought to the local Teacher Centers by a number of university and school district representatives. Three of the persons interviewed have extensive experience in both the school district and the universities. It was pointed out that being familiar with and accepted by at least the major cultures represented on the advisory council can have invaluable results in promoting collaborative activity.

WEST TEXAS

Selection Selection of individuals is up to the participating institutions or organizations except for community parents who are selected by the local school district.

Tenure Parents are selected for a two year term as is the representative at large, but the term of office of the other members is "continuous." One respondent felt that while superintendents serve on the council year after year, teachers are on the council from year to year and are consequently at a disadvantage. Under an expected change teachers will serve for two year periods.

Orientation Again there appears to be no formal orientation of members to the work of the council. While all respondents thought positively about the council and were certainly supportive of its goals, some felt that due to a lack of understanding of terminology and political undercurrents much of what was going on was incomprehensible and "over my head." One respondent, when asked what the council might do to orient some members for effective membership, said that it would be important to understand how a university works and of what the education of teachers presently consists. It was also said that while the "members conducting the business" obviously know their work and are committed to it, they overlook the lay person who is neither familiar with the language found in the proposals, nor, consequently, with what the actual function of a specific proposal may be, nor with its intended relation to subsequent activities.

Two respondents were not entirely clear what the full scope of the membership of the council was and did not know how to tell when the full council was present. One member recalled that on one occasion he noted another person being present and involved in the discussion, but was not clear whether he was a member and if so what group he represented.

Resources The service center brings a particularly well-developed materials resource center to the Teacher Center. It also seems to have established an extensive service network and to have become well-known in the surrounding school districts. Thus it is in a good position to help implement and strengthen Teacher Center work. As in the case of Dallas many of the principal actors at West Texas bring considerable experience to the council with each other's institutional cultures. It seems beyond question that this has facilitated communication and understanding among the major council members.

HOUSTON

Selection As already noted, the director of the center is appointed by the University of Houston. Appointment of members of the Operations Committee is done at the discretion of each of the institutions and organizations involved.

Tenure Each member organization determines the term of service for its representative. The bylaws do not mention the duration of service for representatives from the university and professional organizations, saying simply that they serve at the pleasure of the institution. Interviews, however, reveal that representatives from both these organizations usually serve for long periods of time. With the exception of Houston, no school district is to be represented on the Operations Committee by both the school district and professional association simultaneously. The terms of office are limited to two years and the members rotate. The Houston school district thus appears to be "permanently" on the board.

Orientation Interviews show that orientation for new members is informal and the Teacher Center director tends to inform new members about the project. It does not seem that the TCIES project is understood by the Operations Committee members interviewed nor do they seem to be aware of the historical relationship between TCIES and the Houston Teacher Center.

Resources The University of Houston provides facilities and materials such as video equipment to the project. The main contribution of the school district is the SB 8 funds. Both school district and university make personnel available to the center. As mentioned previously, in January 1975 the advisory board voted to establish a special Teacher Center account to be "administered by the Operations Committee." Money from this account is used under the signature of the executive director. The funds represent a 60 percent cut of the $50 per student teacher that comes from the state to each member school district. At $30 for approximately 1100 student teachers, this total amounts to about $33,000. The remaining $20 out of each $50 stays with the school districts.

The executive officer, of course, brings to his job substantial experience and ability in the area of teacher education, but he is also respected for his leadership skills and his abilities as a political strategist. Although characterized by some as "passively aggressive," teachers appear to regard him as helpful and interested in their cause. He has given teachers a lot of help with needs assessment and in locating consultants for in-service programs. He seems to treat teachers with great respect; they believe he genuinely considers them as professionals and will aid them in gaining more control of teacher training and certification. Other university representatives are also respected for the knowledge and information they can contribute and for their administrative skills, which involve the placing of student teachers in the schools. They also contribute skills in proposal writing and knowledge about federal and state funds likely to be available to support Teacher Center efforts. School district representatives, on the other hand, are experienced administrators and knowledgeable about political matters.

FORT WORTH

Selection The method of selection and appointment of members to the board is not clearly described in available documents. It appears that the advisory council votes on whether to admit new institutions or organizations to membership on the council, and then the institutions or organizations themselves select their representatives.

Tenure Some council members have been on the board since 1970,

74

when the project was associated with TTT. The original Teacher Center director has been with the council since its inception, as has one of the community representatives. The education service center representative has been involved for at least two years. The length of involvement of the member universities other than Texas Christian University varies from two years to a few months; that is, the University of Texas at Arlington joined the Teacher Center in the fall of 1974. The center coordinator (from the school district) has been involved in the project since at least 1972 while the present director joined the project and the council in March 1974. The length of term of council members seems to be open-ended.

Orientation Though no formal orientation seems to exist, it may not be necessary because of the longevity of the members. Newer members seem to have gained their information and understanding of the project informally.

Resources The matter of resources available for the FWTC was not formally resolved as of the spring of 1975. Although the sum of university contributions to the project is yet to be committed, the project does have Fort Worth school district, Texas Christian University and education service center support for instructional materials, staff, and travel. The unresolved university financial aid is to be used to compensate professors participating in the Teacher Center.

The apparent resource question that seems unique to Fort Worth and will eventually have to be addressed is: what resources will be used for core operational support when TCIES ceases to provide the project aid for a full-time coordinator, a secretary and a part-time internal evaluator?

I. ROLES OF THE PARTNERS

In this section a number of comments will first be made relative to the traditional roles of council partners and the consequent political forces for conflict, with some suggested rewards that, it may be argued, would accrue to the different members as a result of their collaboration. This will be done under the subheadings of stereotypes and rewards below and will apply to each of the local Teacher Centers studied. Each local Teacher Center will then be discussed in turn with comments on these topics and others as may seem appropriate.

Stereotypes

a. Colleges and universities -- historically have been in charge of preservice education. They have enjoyed a certain measure of autonomy in this area which is hard for them to relinquish. Over the years the impression has developed that professional teacher trainers know more about what preservice education should consist of and how it should be designed than do practitioners. The university, with its ivory tower image, is considered to be intellectually removed from the practical concerns of daily life. There has been a traditional separation between field-based and campus-based programs. Professors are thought to be reluctant to "get their hands dirty" and are considered to be somewhat inexperienced in

76

administrative and political realities. They are rewarded for their publications rather than for their project work, direct service, or attention to existing educational problems in the schools. They do not receive the same rewards for team accomplishment as for individual efforts for which they can claim total or primary credit.

Practitioners tend to blame universities for the "irrelevant" preparation they receive and generally feel that schools of education have not made very effective contributions to the problems of education. Many feel that the interests of the universities do not necessarily coincide with those of the local community. The board of governors of a university is not likely to be made up of local citizens, and is therefore likely to espouse a philosophical outlook and interest different from that prevalent in the local community. Also, the legal and financial basis of the university does not make it directly accountable for the successes and failures of the public schools.

b. Independent School Districts -- historically have lacked involvement in teacher education. Their function has been associated with the education of children and youth and not with the preparation of teachers. In Texas, teachers are considered prepared for their job on a lifetime basis once they have graduated from an approved Texas college or university. The renewing or updating of teaching skills has usually not been scheduled into the typical school day in any systematic way. Little if any time is formally set aside for teachers to prepare their classroom lessons. Individual teachers generally feel that they have little power in determining the curriculum and materials to be used in their school. In fact, typically, it is felt that decision making over such matters need not include teachers. Traditionally the social status of teachers is low. Finally, the school system must be responsive to its local and national tax base and to its governing body of lay citizens and is, consequently, set apart from the universities, which are not as directly accountable to an identifiable body.

c. Professional associations -- have been involved in research on teacher education and have set up committees to work on the difficult task of setting professional standards. They have shown a commitment to improve teacher preparation programs. Nevertheless, traditionally the professional associations are considered to be politically oriented rather than program oriented, and have a reputation for being more concerned with promoting the welfare of their members than with improving their professional skills.

d. Community and business organizations -- are considered ultimately the people to whom schools are responsible. That responsibility has never been well-defined nor has the role of the community been extended to deciding what should happen in a classroom. Over the years and in this post industrial age the difference between what passes as education and what society needs and wants--or ought to need and want--has become less and less clear, harder to define. It has also become evident that there is no one community but many, and that their values and beliefs may be sufficiently different to warrant thinking of them as different cultures. The idea of America as a mosaic is gaining ground over that of America as a melting pot.

The idea of school as a business or corporate enterprise has received some support. The Bill of Rights has been brought into the classroom. Enough specialists exist to claim a monopoly over almost any aspect of organized education that one can think of. The role of the expert has always been much admired even to the extent of accepting without doubt the beliefs of professors and administrators, but that is gradually changing too.

All these factors make it increasingly difficult to decide the what and how and why of formal education and thus delineate the role of any particular group.

Rewards If the Teacher Center program were expanded nationwide, each of the four major member groups would conceivably expect some rewards for their participation. Whether these rewards would actually accrue remains to be seen.

a. Colleges and universities--would acquire a powerful lever to effect change on their own campuses, constituting both a political and conceptual force; they would share ideas and experiences with other universities, especially in the area of the Texas Education Agency where unofficial rules and regulations are said to be proliferating; and they would stand together on common issues and concerns and generally be better-informed. Their explicit and deliberate association with the schools would make it easier to bring professional expertise to bear on specific problems. After all, it would open for study the actual topic that defines the interests of a school of education, namely, education itself.

b. School districts -- would stand to gain better student teachers and a better pool of potential employees, and would exert influence for more responsive training programs, especially with regard to new roles such as those of diagnostician, helping teacher, planner, futurist, computer programmer, administrative conflict manager, and evaluator. School districts would have better access to a larger and wider range of skills and resources. Instead of shouldering sole responsibility for what has become a major social problem they could share it to their own advantage and that of their students with the very forces that they would otherwise contend with.

c. Professional associations-- would gain a better understanding of the educational process, and draw on the reservoir of experience of their members in defining problems, priorities, and new directions. They would gain a political lever that would help them achieve their goal of exercising greater influence in the areas of program accreditation and certification, and in the status and salaries of teachers.

d. Community and business organizations --through representation in a Teacher Center, would help the education establishment achieve the lifestyle the community desires. The Teacher Center could become yet another organized way in which the goals and conduct of education could be subjected to continuous discussion and scrutiny by all of society's different interests and points of view. The Teacher Center could act as a forum through which the community could influence the program approval process and thus influence the training of personnel. Community members could also learn more about what is involved in teacher education. By involving other institutions and the community in educational problems, the schools would have additional opportunities to get their ideas and procedures across to the very people they seek to serve. This would surely result in a better understanding of what they are seeking to do, and thus lead to the satisfaction derived from doing it better.

SAN ANTONIO

The role of each of the five groups involved in the SATEAC will be considered in turn. Statements made below are based on comments made by respondents in the course of the interviews.

The colleges and universities play the leadership role in the group. While they constitute only about one-third of the membership, they control, according to the executive officer, 90 percent of the decision-making power, mainly in the form of permitting actions to go on by not exercising veto power. Other informants indicated that, despite this potential for leadership, the colleges opt for only a minimal program, exerting a blocking tendency for most nonmandated proposals. It is asserted that they take this posture to protect their interests and to avoid losing even more power and control over the teacher education programs. Their predominant characteristics are anxiety and a feeling of being threatened.

The independent school districts tend to take a laissez faire posture. They have, it is asserted, more important fish to fry and their spotty attendance record bears this out. According to one informant the school district did attempt to take a positive posture toward teacher education through the operation of its own in-service programs when teachers complained that college programs were not responsive to their needs. The teachers found the school district programs no more appealing, however, and they were dropped. The school districts are now willing to let the center pick up the training role, but are cautious in the way they are involving themselves.

The role of the educational service centers is hard to assess. The executive officer claims that the service center is supportive of SATEAC for "idealistic" reasons (general improvement of education), and because SATEAC can enlarge the range of services available to the clients of the service center. Detractors of the service center charge that the executive officer's interest is based upon presumed budgetary and staffing advantages for the education service center. There is not enough data available to resolve this dilemma, nor is there ever likely to be, but there is no question of the service center's general operational support.

The role of the Texas State Teachers Association is evolving. Originally, some respondents suggested its representatives were overawed by the college personnel and felt uninformed on teacher training programs. Now that the awe is down and the level of information up, new agenda items are emerging. The association is seeking more professional involvement in teacher training, accreditation, and certification, possibly even to the extent of having its function vested in a state board consisting of professional personnel. It is beginning to see all local Teacher Centers as possible sources of leverage to this end and also as channels for feedback on teacher education issues. It seems likely that the professional representatives will become increasingly more vocal and more powerful in SATEAC.

Finally, the community role is also changing. The interviews indicated that the community representatives originally felt uninformed and unable to grapple with the issues at a sufficiently high professional level. But experience is tending to alleviate these feelings. The chief note with the community is accountability. If poor teachers cannot be eliminated once they are teaching, it is essential to eliminate them during the training process, and SATEAC is a vehicle toward that end. In general, however, the community representatives seem to be sympathetic and supportive of change and view the SATEAC experience as an unusually useful feedback channel for information about schools.

There seem to be at least five major areas of conflict:

1. Historical conflicts exist which set university against university, university against service center, service center against school district, and Texas State Teachers Association against the Texas Classroom Teachers Association. Reasons for these conflicts include the fact that universities and the service center both have a legal in-service mandate, different universities and professional associations compete with each other, and school districts, especially in large cities, seem to see the services offered by the service center as inferior to those they could provide themselves. By state law, however, the school systems and the service centers are required to cooperate. All these conflicts tend to be reflected in SATEAC deliberations. Members find it hard to divest themselves of their historical loyalties in order to deal objectively

with one another.

2. A certain amount of interuniversity competition also exists. The area universities naturally compete for students. They seem to feel that the program review process unfairly requires them to give away trade secrets. They do not feel that they can get a fair and open critique of their programs from their competitors. For reasons of their own self-interest, they are not too critical, even if deserved, of the program proposals of their competitors, lest they be overly critical in return.

With five universities in the area, effective competition for students depends on creative and responsive programs. If all programs are alike, all students will eventually attend the University of Texas at San Antonio since it will have the lowest tuition. SATEAC will have to exercise caution to avoid pressing the universities into a common program, thereby discouraging diversity.

3. The program review process is also an area of conflict. The universities naturally feel a great loss of autonomy, control and power as a result of the Texas Education Agency requirement that program proposals be reviewed by the local Teacher Centers. This tends to create conflicts not only among the colleges but between the colleges and the rest of the board. At SATEAC the colleges feel especially threatened by the practice of excerpting reports from the minutes for the Texas Education Agency's attention.

4. The service center was selected as a neutral ground, but its

ability to provide operational funding has made it peculiarly unneutral. At one time, it is asserted, it was actually proposed that the service center become the SATEAC. While this effort was defeated there remain a number of board members who persist in ascribing to the service center the motivation of adopting the Teacher center for its own ends.

5. A status conflict exists among the members of the board, especially between the colleges at one extreme and the professional and community representation at the other. The colleges are seen as patronizing, the professionals and community representatives as uninformed. Obviously this tends to prevent the center from receiving the conceptual and program development skills the college people might bring as well as the "real world" practical skills which other members might bring.

DALLAS

Most respondents were quick to assert that an atmosphere of trust and cooperation exists among council members. They were willing to say that disagreements and differences are accepted without jealousy, and that individual universities were, by and large, willing to listen, to accept criticisms, and also to criticize each other. In the view of those interviewed in Dallas, however, the budding cooperative relationships between the universities and the schools are probably not easily duplicated elsewhere.

One respondent felt that the advisory council had made a lot of progress in its attempts at working together. Once meetings consisted of a series of glowing reports from committees, with the actual decisions being made in somebody's office, but they have progressed to forms of open exchange and debate with a minimum of hidden agendas. Now, in this person's view, in an hour or an hour and a half of meeting time, unanimous decisions are the rule.

Two other respondents, while agreeing that openness to different viewpoints and a willingness to work together do exist, would rather say that competition has not openly surfaced, or that a full scale advisory meeting is indeed "a wonderful show." They point to the lack of role definition for groups such as the service center and the community, and to the fact that while the advisory council consists of different ethnic groups, the input of some of these groups is not yet what it should be.

At least one respondent was willing to abandon the word parity and adopt something called "functional involvement" instead. The difference in terminology is meant to suggest that, rather than striving for an equal voice for each partner on all issues, it is more sensible to develop the kind of trust under which each member organization can be counted on for its particular strengths. This, however, requires defining roles and boundaries of influence and that seems to be a major preoccupation of DTEC at this moment.

Respondents pointed out that some institutions or organizations have already defined roles which must change while others have never really had any defined roles to begin with. For example, the university reward system is based on published work while time spent working with public schools detracts from the pursuit of the publishing goal. University professors have a natural reluctance, therefore, to expand their roles to include work with school systems when they know full well that such expenditures of time actually penalize their advancement under the tenets of their own institutions. A professor who devoted considerable time and effort developing competency statements and who did not receive tenure could not help presume that these efforts had not been valued as highly as the more acceptable publication of a scholarly article. Professional associations, on the other hand, have never provided a reward system even approaching that of the publish or perish syndrome.

Whether it is easier to redefine an established role or define a new role to conform to the Teacher Center concept is a moot question.

The role of the service center, it is said, should rest primarily with making information available and with facilitating the exchange of information among schools and universities. The service center is desirous of having a greater impact on Dallas, first as it is reported to have had on smaller school districts. The Dallas school district, however, appears to believe that it not only can provide the services the service center provides, but it can do so better and at lower cost.

The contribution of the state education agency was primarily in the legal and procedural areas. Through a representative, state legal and bureaucratic complexities could be brought before the council when they would do the most good, namely, when policy or program questions were being discussed. An example of this sort of input from the state occurred when the council was reviewing a policies and procedures document pertinent to preservice teacher education. The representative from the Texas Education Agency was able to suggest a number of changes in the document to assure compliance with the freedom of information law. Problems with late payment of teachers' salaries, for example, could be resolved more efficiently, it was explained, by working with a representative of the state familiar with local conditions and personnel. By and large, however, it was agreed that the roles of the state, the community, and the professional organizations were the least well defined.

The council has not escaped some of the conflicts already pointed out at the beginning of this section. Teachers resent being told what to do by university professors. Professors believe themselves to be most qualified when it comes to teacher education; on the other hand, administrators wish to retain their authority. The representatives of the different organizations have to understand and respect each other's language, and direct their activities toward a communal goal rather than preserving partisan policies. Just as necessary, it was pointed out, is some means of communication between council members and their own organizations so that the separate organizations can responsibly define their roles.

There is evidence that some of the partners are accepting and examining the differences to see what solutions can be negotiated.

Respondents say that it is now possible for a professor and a practicing teacher to discuss the effectiveness of a student teacher reasonably and candidly. The result has been that a document on the rights of student teachers has been worked up. One respondent recalled that a turning point in attitude was reached when it became clear that it was possible to be chairman of one of the advisory council committees without being a professor.

Even though preconceptions are breaking down and the efficiency and effectiveness of the council is increasing, there is still the feeling that substantive differences in role effectiveness exist. Lay members are said to feel that they can add little to the discussion after it reaches levels beyond their expertise, and as a consequence, feel excluded. In a sense this situation is seen as being justified and the attendant problems as being caused by poor definition of roles. All respondents seem to agree that member roles have definite boundaries and that these should be defined and negotiated. While the community might not contribute any technical expertise community representatives can challenge values and clarify assumptions, especially in the area of racial or social class differences. Community representatives could thus be relied on to help the council better understand the students' home and community environments. In Dallas community representatives have organized guided tours for council members to acquaint them with aspects of community life with which they are not familiar.

WEST TEXAS

The major, most influential partners seem to be the university, the school districts and the service center. All respondents agreed that the three partners worked together effectively and that substantial progress had been made. On the other hand, there were also prognostications on the future such as "it won't work, it's political as hell."

All persons interviewed agreed that the traditional autonomy enjoyed by the individual partners is a thing of the past. They indicated that they are working toward the same goals, and that they recognize the inadequacies of present representation and decision making in teacher education. Teacher Center officials feel that it is only the top level of administrative personnel at West Texas State University who fail to see that the university's effectiveness can be increased through cooperation, indeed, that its best chances for meaningful survival depend on cooperation.

The service center has had a lengthy involvement with the twenty-six counties in the northern part of the panhandle. It has offered an extremely wide range of services, and, respondents report, has met with considerable success. It has not restricted itself to being a resource center, although it has a large and well-stocked facility. For some time it has offered workshops and other educational experiences which West Texas State University recognized for acadmic credit for participating teachers. Overlapping experiences were not offered in order to avoid conflicts between the service center and the university. Respondents felt that an unwritten understanding governed this relationship to keep them from "stumbling over each other." That relationship, however, is said to be deteriorating to the point where collaboration is becoming impossible. Also, as already noted in a previous section, a redirection in university policy is making it increasingly difficult for the school of education to give academic credit to teachers who participate in the workshops offered by the service center.

Faculty members in the school of education at West Texas State University are portrayed as being interested in collaborating with the Teacher Center and as being supportive of competency-based teacher education--conditions which the Teacher Center and the dean of the school of education have been interested in promoting. The relationship between the university and the school system is also portrayed as being healthy and cooperative. In a sense, however, it may be untested. For example, apparently the university controls the faculty appointments it makes in the various schools. While the school system might want to exercise some influence over these appointments, especially as far as the adequacy of performance of the faculty member is concerned, the issue, as one respondent put it, "simply hasn't arisen."

All respondents would probably agree that so far as the role of the parent, the teacher, and the community are marginal. In part, these roles have not been defined; in part, their input is limited because they are not fully aware of the nature and scope of the emergent struggles between major partners, especially the university and the service center.

Two respondents saw the lack of inputs on the part of the community and the teachers as due to the combined efforts of two factors: the desire on the part of the major partners to retain power, and the lack of aggression on the part of the community and teacher representatives to participate. Teachers were cited as needing some "consciousness raising" and as being deficient in influence.

Here, too, as in Dallas, a concrete situation seems to be emerging which will bring the matter of commitment and collaboration to a head. A bilingual proposal has been submitted to the Office of Education which, if funded, would require the university and the school districts to work closely together in the field. Project funds would pay for the recruitment of new faculty to teach in the bilingual program for a period of up to five years. Eventually these courses are expected to generate enough credit hours to warrant receiving money from the state, and, in that sense, the program is expected to become self-supporting in due time. The willingness of West Texas State University to participate in this cooperative endeavor would imply their eventual willingness to continue it after the proposal funds have run out. The hope is that the different partners will learn to work together successfully by the time the program becomes self-supporting and the bilingual program is institutionalized.

HOUSTON

The university appears to be the primary leader in this project, although not necessarily dominating the school districts. One respondent felt that teachers have been listened to more this year than in the past, especially by school district administrators. In Houston, school district representatives seem to communicate regularly with their administration and with school district teachers about Teacher Center activity. University representatives are actively seeking to increase university involvement in the project. University involvement is said to have increased this year over the previous one resulting in the regular involvement of about 25 percent of the college of education faculty.

Again, in Houston, there seems to be good communication between the teachers and the Teacher Center. Much important information about Teacher Center activity seems to be exchanged on an informal basis; it seems common for people to stop by the project director's office for conversation before or after a meeting. Committee members indicated that they get drafts of documents such as new preservice programs prior to Operations Committee meetings on a regular basis. Two respondents, who suggested the general content of a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, listed this contribution as an example of their participation. Based on their input the University of Houston representatives prepared the proposal for the Teacher Center. Other committee members, however, seemed to be unfamiliar with the contents of the proposal when it was discussed at an Operations Committee session in May. Discussion of other matters at this meeting, with which all members seemed familiar, included a new bilingual program for the college of education and recent development of competencies for supervising teachers.

Serious conflict was skillfully avoided by Operations Committee members who indicated that differences and disagreements are generally handled outside of formal meetings. There certainly seemed to be frank open expressions of differing points of view on the part of Operations Committee members at this meeting as they dealt with review of the bilingual program, consideration of a policy on Teacher Center publications, and efforts to evaluate school administrators. For example, one professional association representative stated that teachers have no choice or control over administrators evaluating their work, and raised the possibility of applying this policy in reverse. The school administration representatives responded that they felt the policies on teacher evaluation should be improved rather than imposing an admittedly inadequate process on administrators.

Rewards

a. The University Traditionally, the position of a tenured, full professor is the ultimate reward that a university system can bestow on a professional educator. There is an apparent and generally strong professional motivation for college of education professors to come in direct and frequent contact with public schools, in order to test their teacher preparation programs in a real setting. It seems logical that the institutional reward system, however, will strongly influence how this professional interest is carried out by individuals. The University of

Houston, according to Operations Committee members, determines tenure and promotion consideration for college of education members applying the same criteria to every discipline. Generally the first concern is the number of publications in refereed journals the individual has accrued. with less emphasis placed on teaching effectiveness and field service. Participation in the Teacher Center project is said to be given strong consideration within the college of education in tenure and promotion recommendations, but this does not appear to be the case at higher administrative levels within the university. Thus, one faculty member in the college of education was recommended for tenure and promotion by the college in large part due to his Teacher Center work although he had not done much traditional publishing. The recommendation was turned down at higher levels within the university. This leads some to say that the reward system within the university does not support working with the Teacher Center strongly enough. The posture of the college of education on this question, however, is seen as a considerable step forward, for it is willing to count the development of a competency-based teacher education module as equivalent to a published material when decisions on promotion and tenure have to be made. One avenue faculty members have considered and are beginning to use consists of conducting research and developing publications based on Teacher Center experiences and field activities in order to meet the university's requirements for tenure and promotion.

b. The School System The school district, of course, has a good opportunity to influence teacher-preparation programs through its work on the advisory board. School district administrators are said to have a strong voice in both the advisory board and the Operations Committee. Teachers are said to have less power than the administrators at the advisory board level but an equal voice with the Operations Committee. One reason given for this is that representatives from teacher associations often cannot take a position on an issue without polling membership; administrators, on the other hand, can speak more readily for the school district on many matters. For teachers the primary reward seems to be their ability to exert some influence on the design and conduct of preservice and in-service training, which has traditionally been imposed by the university professors and school district administrators, and has been restricted to course offerings at a university. There also appear to be benefits to individual teachers. A joint effort on the part of the school district, the state and the university has furnished additional funds and improved conditions for staff development. Individual teachers are also said to be gaining some skills in program development that apply directly to their own teaching situations. According to Operations Committee members teachers "want the university to come to them--to respect and use their expertise" and the Teacher Center almost forces this to happen.

FORT WORTH

Although formal agreement on matters of authority, resources and roles has not been obtained, and new bylaws are to be formulated, it appears that council members can work together reasonably well. The director feels he can gain support for anything he needs to accomplish.

The representatives from Texas Christian University probably exert more influence on the council than do representatives from the other universities. One respondent maintained that, on joint endeavors, Texas Christian University representatives "dominate the other university members" and that the university's point of view or ideas generally emerge, while input from other universities is overlooked. One reason for this may be that although there is only one Texas Christian University representatives on the council, the part time evaluator of the project and the representative on the Professional Competency in Teaching Committee also attend council meetings. There is also some pertinent past history: Texas Christian University was at one time not only the grantee agency, but a former director of the project still represents them at council meetings. Finally, it may be that the contribution of funds from Texas Christian University, which was mentioned previously, adds to the sense of imbalance in roles and levels of participation of member universities.

Theoretically, universities will be capable of improving their own training programs through a better understanding of the school district and its problems. However, as is usually the case with universities, their own reward systems usually discourage much direct work in school systems. According to one respondent, during 1974-75 Texas Christian University decreased the importance of field-based activity and teaching in decisions on promotion and tenure, stressed the role of research and publication. A case that illustrates the general university tendency toward rewarding research and publication is unfolding in the Fort Worth area now. A young professor who, according to Teacher Center council members, is outstanding in his performance in field=based training at one of the four Teacher Center sites, is due for consideration for tenure and promotion this year. The university representatives on the Teacher Center council believe he should be rewarded, but they do not expect he will be, as he has not published enough nor has he tended to public relations functions at his university. Such developments discourage many university faculty members who realize that, although their time spent supervising and working with student teachers is extremely demanding, it is not rewarded by the university.

The school district through its participation in the Teacher Center has an opportunity to influence teacher-training program, something they could do previously only very indirectly if at all. The community is rewarded by having an opportunity to contribute their ideas, opinions, and concerns to the planning of the council. The Teacher Center also provides an avenue through which young teachers may become exposed to minority students, thereby eliminating any fear or prejudice they may have.

J. ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

SAN ANTONIO

Because of the historical perception of SATEAC as a holding company or clearinghouse, few activities have been undertaken. The earlier program thrust in competency-based education has largely disappeared, due to the attorney general's decision on competency-based certification.

The only mandated activity is program review, about which there is a difference of opinion. Some people feel it implies evaluation, others mere critique; still others, predominantly the universities, feel it is merely a "sharing of information." Some participants describe program review as a searching, sometimes even harsh process, while others think of it as "Mickey Mouse" and perfunctory. There is concern that it may cause over-conformity and stultify creativity, which leads some members to search for avenues of involvement much earlier in the development process.

The only programmatic activity is the student teaching Needs Assessment Program. This program was approved in desultory fashion by the board in July 1974 and since then has been speeded into operation by the executive officer. As was noted earlier, the rapidity of implementation was resented by several board members, causing the Needs Assessment Project to become a cause celebre. At the present time, individual board members are contemplating what to do next, and will discuss desirable steps at the next regular meeting.

The mode of collaboration on both the mandated and programmatic activities can only be described as less than ideal. Program review would probably be abandoned by the colleges if they had a choice. Substantial elements of the board believe the needs assessment project is a waste of time and resources and, since the only two ongoing activities have not met substantial approval, the prognosis of future collaboration cannot be predicted.

DALLAS

In Dallas the school district and each participating university signed a document called "Agreement to Develop a Cooperative Program of Laboratory Experiences" in order to put SB 8 into operation. The agreement listed seven functions that the DTEC, acting by and through the council, was expected to perform. Five of these functions dealt with substantive matters; only one, however, has been carried out explicitly: the recommendation of in-service improvement programs for supervising teachers. As a result an early childhood program presented by one of the participating colleges underwent some revisions at the hands of the council and was then submitted to the Texas Education Agency; that college now offers a certification program in early childhood education. A similar cycle of events was followed in the case of a reading-specialist program at a different university. Some university classes have been conducted in at least one Area Teacher Center and the structure of an elementary education program at another university changed its time schedule and included on-site instruction. No effort was made to inventory the activities of the board in any comprehensive way so, undoubtedly, many more examples of this work exist. Functions not really addressed were: to recommend criteria for the selection of cooperating schools as well as policies for their operation; to recommend criteria and procedures for maintaining a roster of teachers eligible to be supervising teachers; to recommend criteria for the selection and use of personnel from the colleges and universities involved; and to cause periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the agreement itself. Some of the functions noted above were not discussed at council meetings.

Each Area Teacher Center is responsible for placing its own teachers, although their boundaries are crossed when such placement is made. At least one respondent noted that the criteria for placing student teachers should be discussed at council meetings since there was some question of whether or not teachers were placed in all areas equitably.

It takes some time before the right moment arrives and a certain course of action is carried out decisively by the council. One respondent recalled that the council had long ago evinced interest in competency-based teacher education and for years had claimed "it was doing it." But, compared to present council activity on the topic, it really wasn't. First, a great many steps had to be taken: competency statements prepared in other states were reviewed; help in the writing of competencies and in organizing clusters was obtained from consultants from different parts of Texas, and verifying and obtaining support from different groups such as classroom teachers at large and administrators was initiated and well under way. Once all responses to the competency statements are received they will be revised and be ready for adoption.

WEST TEXAS

The bylaws for the WTTC list a number of functions of the advisory council. One states that the council is to serve as a base for studying local teacher education program needs. As a result, the council determined that a bilingual education proposal should be submitted to the Texas Education Agency through the Teacher Center seeking federal funds. In this proposal the education service center was named as the fiscal agent, distributing funds to each partner for services as they were provided. The Teacher Center has prepared other proposals as well. One aimed at assessing the impact of competency-based education and, submitted to TCIES, called for the evaluation of competency-based teacher education graduates. In this case, West Texas State University was named as the fiscal agent and money was included for the services of the public schools and the service center.

Another function of the council is to plan the kinds of facilities and support the local school districts are to provide for student teachers and for which SB 8 supplies fifty dollars. As one respondent stated, "we have not gotten into this;" the university and the school district have simply continued their existing agreements and procedures. Apparently, though, a plan is under consideration that would require the service center and the university to contribute to SB 8's fifty dollars in order to support an evaluation project.

A third function of the council is to advise colleges and universities on their teacher education and certification programs. All proposals relative to certification questions are reported to be going through the Teacher Center. Respondents stated that before the competency-based teacher education mandate was rescinded, Teacher Center partners collaborated on preparing competency statements that practicing teachers endorsed and West Texas State University faculty members adopted. Apparently the school of education at West Texas State University was mostly competency-based, but has drifted away from that position since the attorney general handed-down his opinion.

The fourth function of the council is to advise local school districts on field experiences for student teachers. Again, during the time that competencies were stressed, teachers and student teachers worked together reviewing and recommending changes in competencies. The curriculum for teachers at the university was organized in modules and was responsive to the needs of student teachers. Some respondents report that work in this area now appears to have diminished.

The fifth function of the council is to advise the local school districts and colleges on in-service programs for supervising teachers. At present this matter is not handled through the Teacher Center although, as one respondent stated, "there is no reason it couldn't be." The traditional practice has been for the university to work with the school districts individually, and that approach continues.

The sixth function of the council is to develop procedures by which supervising teachers from the school districts can be recommended to serve in the student-teaching program. Again, it was reported that "this could go through the Teacher Center," but so far nothing has changed. One opinion was that it could probably not be done any more efficiently than it is now, although working it through the Teacher Center would have the advantage of involving the service center. Principals, according to the respondent, like the option of deciding who the supervising teachers will be, and they are, after all, in the best position to make that decision. None of the respondents objected to the present (and traditional) way of handling this matter; although, they said, they would not necessarily be opposed to involving the Teacher Center.

Finally, the seventh function of the council is to "involve other agencies and groups" in an advisory capacity, and this, too, has yet to be done.

HOUSTON

The Operations Committee carries out numerous activities authorized in their bylaws. Major efforts include: (1) studying teacher education/certification programs and advising the University of Houston about them; (2) developing policies for the project; (3) recommending criteria for selection of supervising teachers; placing student teachers; directing in-service programs for supervising teachers; and (4) preparing proposals in order to increase resources and the role of the Teacher Center.

The most recent University of Houston teacher education program reviewed by the Operations Committee was one in bilingual education. Respondents indicated that they had seen an earlier version of the bilingual program, had reviewed and commented on it, and that the latest version seemed to take into account all the changes they desired. The feeling at this latest meeting on that proposal was that the university really did seem to seek the committee's advice and took account of their comments.

The Operations Committee is developing policies on difficult and important topics of concern to membership. One of its activities is the study of recent legal actions related to the rights of student teachers in Texas from which it will attempt to develop a just policy covering this difficult and potentially costly subject. Another example is a subcommittee established to develop a policy on publication rights. University representatives were candid and school district representatives were responsive to this expressed need for a policy allowing university representatives to use Teacher Center material for university publication practices.

Indications are that there is a fair amount of give and take among Operations Committee members and that issues are worked through rather than dealt with superficially.

The fourth major activity of the Operations Committee has been to submit to FIPSE a proposal which will have three major purposes: (1) to develop competencies for school-based teacher educators (supervisory teachers) and criteria for awarding credentials to in-service trainers who demonstrate these competencies in the school district; (2) to design and test the mechanics for accomplishing this proposal by other Teacher Centers and school districts; and (3) to develop and test a "recognition system" for rewards in pay, status, and title to be built into the school system. The ultimate aim of the proposal is to bestow upon the teachers the responsibility and power to improve their own profession. The Operations Committee will administer this project if the grant is received.

Each respondent at this site was asked to comment on areas it was hoped the Teacher Center would address in the future. Their responses varied: a school district representative would like to see the Teacher Center seek and receive funds to support more evaluation and research efforts; in this person's view, SB 8 does not allow enough money for evaluation of teacher-training programs or for research in the content of training activities. A University of Houston professor indicated that the Teacher Center is being considered as a way for the college of education to expand its activities through increased service to the school districts. The university would provide field-based technical assistance and in-service training rather than bring full-time graduate students in education to the university. A self-study commission established by the university to to redistribute and plan the growth of the university is interested in the topic because of the student enrollment quotas imposed by the state. The coordinating board for higher education in Texas has limited the total size of the University of Houston, which already has 29,500 students, to 30,000 students for the next few years.

The need was also expressed for further federal or state support so that the Teacher Center can develop and experiment with new programs. In fact, even existing efforts in competency-based teacher education and needs assessment would be refined and developed further, but financial support is lacking.

FORT WORTH

Perhaps the major activity of the Teacher Center in 1974-75 was the development of a report on "The Organization of Student Teaching as a Cooperative Effort to Prepare Professionally Competent Teachers," which was adopted by the council and termed a "landmark document." The document deals with purposes and functions of student teaching, function and selection of supervising teachers and college teacher educators, principles and procedures for assessing student teacher performance, and functions of the Fort Worth Teacher Center in teacher education. Respondents felt that this document reflected two years of struggle to resolve difficult issues. Its adoption should allow the Teacher Center to deal more effectively with operational problems, such as the selection and placement of student teachers over large geographic areas involving several universities. This report was developed by a committee that included council members, and several classroom teachers. The council members felt that extensive involvement of practitioners would result in broad acceptance of the report and aid efforts to put its contents into operation.

A second activity of the Fort Worth project during 1974-75 was to develop and improve its management component. This activity did not progress very well and reasons for its failure were discussed by the advisory council. The council decided that, before this activity could be properly tackled, the roles of participants and existing channels of authority needed to be clarified. There is also a need to clarify the role participating institutions play in granting financial aid as well as the amount of time needed to govern the implementation of activities. A Teacher Center report also implied that full commitment to the task by all members is lacking. One can only guess that problems with project management may affect other Teacher Center activities.

In response to a request for comments on the future of the Fort Worth project, a number of ideas were expressed: One community representative indicated that the council should look for increased sources of funds for the project through proposal writing and through support from the business community. It was also suggested that the Teacher Center should make its activities known to professionals in the community. One university representative wanted the Teacher Center to consolidate its present efforts rather than to initiate new ones; another university representative suggested the Teacher Center should work for a program in which students are offered field experience in their junior year. Some disagreement on how SB 8 funds should be used soon became apparent: university representatives want funds to be spent on in-service training for supervising teachers while the school district representatives want the funds to be used more broadly.

K. LEADERSHIP

SAN ANTONIO

Individual leadership is provided by the SATEAC executive officer. He manages all the routine affairs and acts to implement the board's decisions. His style is not appreciated by all, however, as was already noted, and he is seen by some as overstepping his authority. He himself seems to view his behavior as necessary to keep the group moving productively. Additional leadership is informally provided by one of the university representatives who, by reason of his age, experience and prior positions, is respected by all the college people and most of the other members. Protecting university interests is his motivation, according to reports, and his style is low key, acerbic.

Institutional leadership is certainly provided by the colleges, which have 90 percent of the decision-making power. Their leadership, however, is apparently conservative and self-protective. The service center provides a site and resources, and, through the SATEAC executive officer, formal leadership.

DALLAS

As has been pointed out the school district is the dominant member on the council. While some members think that originally the council was more dictatorial than it is now, others see a gradual change in favor of open constructive debate with differences being accepted and negotiated, and decision making is shared. It appears that at least some of the representatives of the organizations sitting at the council have developed mutually respectful and supportive, and friendly but firm working relationships.

From the limited data available one is led to suppose that at least the school district and the universities are developing a collaborative working relationship, although this could of course be challenged on the grounds that the sample of persons interviewed was too small and restricted. Given the size of the council (about forty-five members) and the fact that it meets only four times per year for perhaps little more than an hour each time, leadership at the committee level must be especially effective, for one can guess that it is at this level where the decisions are made.

WEST TEXAS

University representatives and the service center representative have regularly exchanged the leadership role, which seems to be determined as much by the source of funding as by political realities. Informal leadership seems to follow the alternating pattern of the formal leadership, which last shifted, because of changing university policy, to the service center. The school districts comprising the other major partner on the council, appear, according to the limited data, to feel comfortable in this situation. The professional associations are anxious to exercise more leadership than they have in the past, and indications are that they will. The major partners say that they would welcome that development, as well as increased participation on the part of the community and business organizations which constitute a valuable resource inadequately used.

HOUSTON

Although the University of Houston shares the leadership role with the Houston Independent School District it appears to be the predominant leader. The university is considered a national leader in the competency-based teacher education movement and local awareness of this status, plus the fact that it sought and successfully gained TTT, TERC, TCIES, and Teacher Corps support for its activities would logically result in its position as prime leader in the Teacher Center. Both the dean of the college of education and the executive officer of the center, who is also an associate dean, have a high level of commitment and involvement.

The Houston school district administration has not hesitated to work openly, cooperatively, and on a large scale with the university. Some personnel from the school district have considered the Teacher Center a valuable resource in their work with difficult urban school settings and in the retraining of administrators and teachers. They are considered to have given some direction to the center while making use of its funds, people and expertise.

In part, of course leadership depends on the authority that members can bring to the board. One school district administrator indicated that he has the authority to commit his school district to any type of teacher selection or assignment procedure, and to direct the choice of training programs. He also controls SB 8 funds by determining the selection of supervising teachers as well as the use of the fifty dollars per student teacher. The representative of the teachers association, to which a little over half of the 8600 classroom teachers belong, can ensure that the project "takes its direction from the teachers...and they have input into in-service training." However, as already noted, the teacher associations are limited by the necessity to poll their respective membership before responding to issues, whereas other representatives can act immediately.

The executive officer of the Teacher Center has authority to prepare and approve proposals and expenditures. He is also authorized to initiate activities that serve the purposes of the center. The authority of the other University of Houston representatives is more limited, however, extending to the control they have over the placement of 1500 - 2000 student teachers each year. School districts, of course, want capable student teachers and depend upon their placement in order to receive SB 8 funds.

Other reasons for the leadership of the University of Houston and the Houston school district representatives are: (1) probably as a result of their longer tenure on the project, they seem more familiar and more comfortable with purposes and activities of the Teacher Center than most other committee members; (2) they have worked together on many occasions and built up strong and respectful working relationships with each other; and (3) they bring a good deal of individual experience and skill.

FORT WORTH

The influence on the council of the previous director and the lack of substantial progesss of the management component of the Teacher Center was already noted. The present director was new to the project in March 1974 when he assumed that position, but is well informed on the history of the project and the complexities of his job. He seems to play a strong leadership role. The previous director also maintains strong ties to Texas Education Agency officials and is influential with other deans of education in the state.

The physical organization of the center project may contribute to confusion about the leadership situation. Because the director of the center is also director of teacher education for the Fort Worth public schools, his office is in the central administration building of the school district, while the center itself is located at the Elder school site. As one respondent put it, "the organization not the people is the problem--responsibility is unclear." When problems arise or decisions need to be made council members do not know whether to turn to the project coordinator whose office is at the Elder site, or whether to contact the project director at his office. The project director indicated that the coordinator essentially carries out the day-to-day operation.

Previous to this year the project served only the Elder pyramid of schools on the north side of Fort Worth. This year the center serves four areas of Fort Worth, yet the coordinator's role is not clear relative to three of the four sites designated. It may also be the case that some university representatives hesitate to accept the status and role of the present Teacher Center coordinator as a decision maker in the project. Both these factors may be confounding leadership roles.

L. LINKAGES

SAN ANTONIO

There are no apparent linkages with other local Teacher Centers. Relationships to TCIES tend to be formal, limited to funding proposals and follow-up activities; however the SATEAC executive officer is a member of the executive committee of the TCIES steering committee. SATEAC has developed two special relations with the Texas Education Agency: (1) it furnishes excerpts of board minutes involving college program proposals, and (2) a Texas Education Agency representative attends regular meetings to provide informal feedback on program proposals. At least one college member does not like this procedure, however, considering the "informal suggestions" to have the weight of mandates.

DALLAS

Relationships to TCIES tend to be formal, limited to budgetary and proposal submission procedures. The four Area Teacher Centers have contact with each other through the council meetings and the work each contributes to overall goals. Student teachers are placed across Area Teacher Center boundaries, but some respondents feel that decentralization into Area Teacher Centers is not only less efficient, but hinders the informal interaction so essential to collaboration.

A representative from the Texas Education Agency, a member of the advisory council, attends meetings regularly, and, as already noted, has provided the council with specific technical assistance and with information on state requirements and guidelines.

One consultant actively involved in DTEC activity is also a member of the TCIES executive committee.

WEST TEXAS

Again, no formal linkages seem to exist with other local Teacher Centers. No representatives from the Texas Education Agency are listed as members of the council, but given the fact that one of its leaders was prominent in the development of the project and has had formal consulting relationships with it, a good informal linkage apparently exists.

HOUSTON

Linkage with other Teacher Centers or agencies is provided through the personal contacts of some of the board members. One school district representative interviewed also provides liaison between his school district and other SB 8 Teacher Centers at Texas Southern University, Texas State University, and the University of Houston at Clearlake. Each of these Teacher Centers differs structurally from the University of

Houston project and from each other. The representative of the Houston Teachers Association serves on the board of a National Education Association-supported Teacher Center in Houston. It is run by and for teachers and is concerned with in-service education. Originally this center was designed to serve only members of the teachers association, but it was later opened to all Houston school district teachers. Much assistance, especially in the areas of needs assessment and program development, was provided this Teacher Center by personnel from the University of Houston Teacher Center.

University personnel, through their contacts with other universities and their informal work in different school systems, also come in contact with different SB 8 Teacher Centers. The executive officer has numerous informal contacts with many other local Teacher Centers throughout Texas. He also works with the Texas Education Agency and TCIES but does not have a formal position with these agencies.

The chairperson of the center's Operations Committee, a classroom teacher, links the project to other Teacher Center activity in two ways. She is a member of the TCIES executive committee and has been active in and continues informal communication with Texas State Teachers Association colleagues and contacts within the Texas Education Agency.

FORT WORTH

Two members of the advisory council from this project also serve on the TCIES executive committee. One is the Teacher Center director, the other a university representative who, as previously mentioned, has strong ties with state agency officials and considerable influence among other deans of education throughout the state. Although there is no state representative on the project's council, those interviewed indicated that they have a good informal communication with the state agency.

The service center representative works with two other SB 8 centers and about eleven school districts besides Fort Worth. At least one of the university representatives also works with a number of other SB 8 centers in the surrounding area. The Teacher Center coordinator, through her position as an Individually Guided Education facilitator, works with school administrators on a statewide basis.

M. EFFECTS

SAN ANTONIO

Originally the purpose of forming SATEAC was to have an ongoing organization that could be flexible in its response to Teacher Center mandates and funding opportunities. Now attention is moving away from this purpose toward more adequate program development. Each of the member groups sees some opportunities for itself and is moving to exploit thme more aggressively. There also seem to be changes in demeanor. Members are less anxious and aggressive than they apparently were at one time and more areas of agreement are emerging; even the cause celebre, the Needs Assessment Project, has some potential for good action.

Clearly the original objectives of SATEAC have not been met. But, since these objectives have now changed, the failure seems to be academic. It is not clear what the new purposes are and it is certainly premature to judge whether they will be met. So far one may infer that SATEAC has been preparing for cooperative action and there seems to be a good chance that collaborative effort will occur.

DALLAS

Important events, such as frequent changes in directors and decentralization into four Area Teacher Centers, have already been mentioned. Here, too, and more to the point of this document, changes in demeanor seem clear and of long-range importance. The basis for strong and productive collaborative action is being set. Stereotypes that different member groups hold of each other are being examined or discussed and often simply destroyed by actual events. Thus, members realize that being a professor is not required in order to chair a committee and that differences of opinion or belief can be accepted and negotiated without necessarily ending in destructive conflict. It is part of the mythology that one must "grow up through the system," or "have been a principal," in order to be a successful administrator or to move into other positions of leadership and influence. Again, the history of the participation of some of the members provides visible exceptions to the rule.

A good deal of programmatic activity has resulted from Teacher Center efforts as already noted in Section I.

WEST TEXAS

It is hard to distinguish the work and results achieved by the education service center from those of the Teacher Center. It is also hard to disentangle the effects of different programs that preceded the Teacher Center and out of which it evolved. One effect that can be tied to the Teacher Center directly is the development and implementation of competency-based teacher education, or, to put it more precisely the competency-based teacher education mandate was used as a vehicle to further establish the Teacher Center. Now that the mandate has been rescinded, indications are that the competency-based teacher education movement has slowed down considerably.

One respondent pointed out that one change that resulted from the collaborative activity of the Teacher Center partners is that student teachers are now often "put into the field" as early as their sophomore year; previously, few student teachers worked in the field, and when they did, it was generally not before their senior year.

It has already been indicated that some changes at the highest administrative levels at West Texas State University may eventually have the effect of reducing the field-based training options available to teachers. The dean of the college of education at West Texas State University is committed to collaborating with the local school districts, as are his department chairpersons and faculty. He appears to be just as willing to work with the school district; they, however, feel hampered by the university's reluctance to actively support the goals of the center. The school districts themselves, it is reported, are willing to make arrangements and release their teachers so they can work with university faculty and thereby implement the goals of the Teacher Center. At the West Texas Teacher Center then, it is as though all the necessary partners are still not meeting at the same table: the higher administration at West Texas State University, representing an external constraint not under the control of the present Teacher Center partners, is bringing collaborative effort to a standstill.

HOUSTON

Two major changes were mentioned by Operations Committee members: (1) there has been increasing support for teacher-participation in determining the direction of teacher preparation/certification programs by university representives; (2) there has been replacement of some school district representatives who have neither respected nor accepted teachers as "coequals" on the Operations Committee. In the view of two influential members of the board, the current (1974-75) Operations Committee members work together very effectively.

Cooperation in the field between school districts and the university is stated as being very good. The University of Houston now can place as many students in early field experience as they deem necessary. According to university professors, all 1100 students who enter the two-year sequence--junior and senior years--are now placed in the school system during their first semester. One respondent indicated that this early placement is the result of the cooperative work between the school districts and the university and that the university has become aware that there is a "great market for in-service education." At the university, however, at least 75 percent of the faculty are involved with masters and doctoral level graduate students in research rather than in field-based training.

A proposal has been submitted to the Fund for Improvement of Post Secondary Education for a sizeable sum over the period 1975-77 and, if it is funded, the Operations Committee is expected to administer it. It is also hoped that this project will serve to generate more collaboration among Teacher Centers throughout Texas.

Possibly more a spin-off than a direct result of a planned effort is a federal grant to support a university training program for supervisory teachers working with student teachers at the Elena Park School District, thereby mainstreaming special education students in Texas. According to one of the university representatives, the special education department of the college of education has been especially cooperative in working with the school district because of prior contact with them through the Teacher Center.

FORT WORTH

A change in directorship of the Teacher Center project occurred in the spring of 1974 and, according to some respondents, this has resulted in the increased participation and improved communication of Teacher Center members.

The primary result of the advisory board's efforts during 1974-75 has been the completion and adoption of their report on "The Organization of Student Teaching as a Cooperative Effort to Prepare Professionally Competent Teachers." Another result of Teacher Center activity includes a new Teacher Corps project, on which Texas Christian University and the Fort Worth school district expect to cooperate during the coming academic year. The project is aimed at giving in-service training to enable teachers to obtain special education endorsements on their certificates. The project will be located at the Elder site and will serve teachers from that pyramid of schools. Interest and acceptance of the in-service project can be attributed to collaborative Teacher Center activity at that site over a long period of time.

The successful operation of the four Teacher Center sites in the Fort Worth school district has led to plans calling for expansion to eight or ten sites next fall. Activity at each of the additional sites will be aimed at upgrading the skills of supervising teachers. It is the hope of the Teacher Center director that eventually the entire Fort Worth school district will be directly influenced by the activities of the Teacher Center project.

N. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS BASED ON LCTEC SITE INTERVIEWS

SAN ANTONIO

Forces supporting collaboration.

1. First and foremost must be included the legal mandate that there be an local Teacher Center.
2. The positive political image of SATEAC as a collaboration agency can be exploited by all members.
3. The general good will of the involved parties. All seem to want to improve teacher education and to operate from positions of integrity, at least as defined in their individual cultural milieu.
4. The growing insight of each of the parties into the potential benefits of collaboration.

Forces hindering collaboration.

1. The historical purposes of SATEAC. As long as it is viewed primarily as a holding company, there can be little operational cooperation.
2. The large number of participants. Five universities, thirteen school districts, the professional associations,

service center, and the two community agencies represented pose a formidable obstacle to effective cooperation.

3. The lack of a good programmatic success experience. The Needs Assessment Project, while off to a rocky start, may yet provide that critical success.

4. The varieties of conflicts inherent in the concept.

5. Disagreement over leadership, which nurtures dissatisfaction and suspicion. Members need an opportunity to examine this issue openly and to reach some consensus about it.

Alternative future scenarios.

1. Disintegration. SATEAC members sublimated traditional rivalries and conflicts when SATEAC was formed, in order to provide mutual support in the face of uncertainties about teacher center mandates and to exploit apparent funding opportunities; however, without these forces to hold SATEAC together, the old hostilities and anxieties will emerge; the universities will have to accommodate to the requirements of SB 8 and the standards, which they can do by forming a new evaluation team outside SATEAC, by having each college form its own local Teacher Center, or by forming some new consortia. The latter solution seems most likely, with emergency of a Roman Catholic consortium, and with Trinity College and the University of Texas at San Antonio as separate entities.

2. The toothless lion. This scenario, in which members will realize that SATEAC is a powerful organization and that their anxieties are unwarranted, SATEAC will then be retained, since it still meets the formal mandates, but as little more than a debating fraternity.

3. Positive emergence. New purposes emerge to replace the old. Members will learn that their anxieties are unwarranted and will wish to seize the opportunity that membership affords. The organization will thus become quite viable. Essential to this scenario is a fairly immediate and impressive success experience--perhaps the Needs Assessment Project.

DALLAS

Forces supporting collaboration.

1. Courage and willingness. It was obvious that all respondents brought good will, energy, and committment to the Teacher Center, as well as willingness to confront issues and to act with resolve.

2. Selective people with interinstitutional experience. Although no criteria for the selection of key people to fill executive and leadership roles was explicitly formulated, council membership shows that a number of key roles are filled by people who have extensive familiarity with at least the university and school district cultures, which makes it possible for them to move expeditiously through bureaucratic mazes, to package and

time messages properly, and to establish their credibility. Language barriers are reduced. Critical liaison among groups is facilitated, each side feeling that its concerns and interests are being reasonably well understood, with critical subtleties receiving attention. A serendipitous advantage developed in the attempt to fulfill those functions and responsibilities the bylaws require, for frequently experienced personnel were brought under the umbrella of the Teacher Center. An example is the placement of student teachers, which does not necessarily mean that the placement of the teachers is subjected to advisory council influence or discussion, but it is a move to associate the functions with the Teacher Center.

3. Social interaction. This becomes an important function, for deliberately or not, each person projects a visible, physical and nonverbal image, conveying much about his history, background, and interests, thereby stimulating fantasies, stereotypes, and fears in others. It is useful, therefore, to provide time and space for this dance to run its course; to interrupt it, or make it impossible, is as destructive to collaborative activity as is preventing explicit negotiation over conflicting interests. Many respondents seem very much aware of these dynamics and recognize the importance of providing time for "unstructured social interaction."

4. A success experience. The experience of working on competency statements seems also to have left a residue important to collaboration. In order for people to become thoroughly involved in an activity, a balance must be struck between discussion and action. There must be enough discussion for all to agree on such basic assumptions, as the project itself, its feasibility, the abilities and capacities available. At some point, however, such discussion becomes superfluous and leads to frustration; a concrete example must be produced around which the different issues can be defined. For a long time it was said that the Teacher Center was competency-based although "we weren't really doing it." Much of the justifiable discussion is now being reduced, and many of the understandable apprehensions are being dealt with now that some concrete examples have been put forward. This balance is a matter of timing and depends on local contexts. The lesson drawn from the experience has general applicability to collaboration on other efforts.

5. Lessons being learned. The DTEC experience is leading some of its members to formulate ways by which it can be made available to others. Some members are putting together a training package on governance with a focus on collaboration.

Some respondents noted that much of the group frustration at the early meetings was due to the fact that people did not have effective ways of dealing with their individual frustrations. As people work together, ways to deal with problems emerge. People develop skills such as organizing meetings, presenting and discussing topics, solving problems.

In addition to these skills, certain procedures or strategies also play an important role in enhancing collaborative activity. For example, it was suggested that the task of defining roles should be approached as quickly as possible and worked on continuously. This would involve identifying the different members or member groups involved, specifying functions and expectations, and defining areas of responsibility and authority. Described as "the bloody part," this is the period in which the necessary issues are broached, the essential relationships built. Implicit to this task of role definition is to substitute for the popular idea of parity the concept of functional involvement, which recognizes that different entites have different contributions to make, are subject to different constraints, and have different responsibilities. As roles become sorted out, job and task descriptions can be prepared and procedures for day to day operations set up.

Other procedures appear to have been inevitable. At the moment the placement of student teachers and the assignment of supervising professors is going on in many ways as it has always been. Some of the functions governing these activities and actually specified in the cooperative agreement as binding the school district and the university over the placement issue have not yet been executed. Similarly, different organizations have been brought in as full members to the council, yet only now are guidelines and criteria for membership being drawn up. Everybody knew that Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical, a primarily black college, had been excluded, but it apparently took some time before the question could be constructively faced, Prairie View admitted, admission guidelines explicitly formulated, and a disturbing discrepancy between intentions and reality identified and confronted.

Some respondents point out that it may be necessary first to bring activities like the placement and supervision of student teachers within the purview of the Teacher Center and proceed slowly to specify the criteria involved. No more may be possible as a first step. Similarly, it was not necessary to have explicit criteria for center membership available to know that it was not properly balanced. This may require living with an activity which, in the eyes of many, is conducted in ways conflicting with the purposes of the Center. That requires patience and perseverance. The belief seems to be that making too early and explicit an issue out of the discrepancy between actual and ideal criteria delays the goal being strived for.

Forces hindering collaboration.

1. Large and unwieldly meetings. When forty-five people representing different and often conflicting interests meet for little more than an hour four times a year in an effort to collaborate on changing well-established procedures, ways of thinking, and institutions, they have problems, to say the least. One respondent noted that only two out of the four meetings were available to deal with the "real nuts and bolts." Much of the first meeting is devoted to becoming reoriented, greeting new and old members, and preparing for the year's work. Much of the last meeting is used to "see where we've been" and look ahead to the next year and future activities. The real work and decision making appears to be done by committees, that meet more frequently. Sheer logistics and time constraints create enormous difficulties.

2. Lack of funds. The main problem facing the center now is that the funds received from TCIES, which pay half the salaries of university professors, are not expected to be available in the coming

year. One respondent pointed out that this situation would test the commitment on the part of the universities, for they would have to underwrite the work of the professors in the schools if their involvement there is to continue.

WEST TEXAS

Forces supporting collaboration.

1. Familiarity. The major personalities of the WTTC have known each other for a long time, know each other's turfs, and respect each other's boundaries. They know how to work together, what each other's interests are, and how not to stumble over each other. From one point of view, this may be collaboration, from another, careful co-existence.

2. Willingness. The major powers on the council seems to be the college of education, the education service center and the school districts. They consider themselves willing to have more involvement on the part of teachers, parents, and the community. On the one hand, respondents pointed out that perhaps more aggressive representatives from each of those member groups are needed. On the other hand, the council holds few meetings and most decisions seem to be made informally among the major partners and/or at the executive committee level. By virtue of their dominance on the council they also exert control over parent membership (the school districts appoint the parent members) and the business/community representative, who is appointed by the council.

Forces hindering collaboration.

1. An unsupportive university attitude. The Teacher Center certainly faces a major barrier in the form of an unsupportive presidency at West Texas State University. However, the center has assigned itself a large number of functions the present partners could presumably work on even in the face of that opposition. Examples are the joint planning of the support the local school districts are to provide student teachers, the development of procedures for recommending supervising teachers, and advising the school districts and the college of education on in-service programs, all activities in which the center is not now involved. Respondents said they saw no reason why these activities could not be carried out through the center, although adequate procedures already exist. If nothing else, one would think that the involvement of the present Teacher Center partners in such activities might end up generating enough pressure to force the unsupportive administration into a more cooperative posture.

Much of the collaborative activity of the center revolved around competency-based teacher education, and, now that it is no longer mandated, that collaborative relationship seems to be growing cold. Perhaps the bilingual proposal recently submitted will become the vehicle for collaboration that the competency-based teacher education movement once was.

HOUSTON

Forces supporting collaboration

Operations Committee members cited at least three forces which contribute to their efforts to attain and maintain cooperative relationships.

1. First is the commitment to competency-based teacher education of Teacher Center members who, in sharing a common philosophy of education, are not hindered by major value conflicts.

2. Second is their shared perception of payoffs or rewards inherent in Teacher Center participation. The representatives seemed to believe that they stand to gain personally, and their institutions benefit through technical assistance, receipt of better student teachers and professional growth.

3. Third, members noted a strong sense of mutual professional respect among the Operations Committee partners. A high level of trust and respect is vital for the meaningful exchange of views, and they feel this level has been attained in the Houston Teacher Center.

Forces hindering collaboration.

Two major constraints to collaboration among partners are the lack of time available for participation, especially release time for teachers, and the lack of funds for further program development.

Another constraint that cannot be disregarded is what is described as fear on the part of tenured teachers of competency-based teacher education. Some advisory board members feel that this fear is due more to ignorance about the topic than anything else. This suggests that a systematic effort should be made to find out how sizable the resistance is, what it is based on, and to explain the program thoroughly.

The Teacher Center program is ultimately expected to become involved in approving preservice and in-service training and certification even to the point of assuming some of the state board functions in this regard. The center has provided for its continued operation through the special Teacher Center fund described earlier. It may, therefore, be able to pursue and explore new collaborative roles while other sites struggle to secure basic operational support.

FORT WORTH

Forces supporting collaboration.

1. The main forces supporting collaboration seem to be the SB 8 mandate and the hope that the Teacher Center will improve the utilization of local resources and better coordinate the placement of student teachers and the selection of supervising teachers.

Forces hindering collaborative efforts.

1. Competency-based teacher education programs are at different stages of development. This makes it harder for all the partners

to move in concert on certain activities and probably influences the selection of supervising teachers and the in-service training opportunities that different universities are able to offer.

2. An exceptionally large number of student teachers are available. Texas Women's University has about 2000 undergraduate students in teacher education, Texas Christian University has about 300 undergraduates in the Forth Worth schools per year, and North Texas State University, with the largest number of majors in teacher education in Texas, has thousands of students it could place in the Fort Worth area.

3. Many council members have to travel a total of two to three hours in order to attend council meetings. A look at a map of the Fort Worth area reveals the distance to the sites at which student teachers are placed. One university representative noted that he works with teachers in seventeen school districts each semester, sits on three advisory councils that meet monthly, and is also responsible for teaching two courses per semester at the university. His travel time is enormous.

4. The distances separating students and supervising teachers, and the way their placement is organized, inhibit building meaningful professional relationships. Supervising teachers, for example, do not meet as a group, nor do they have adequate opportunities to interact sufficiently with university professionals.

O. ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS BASED ON INTERVIEWS WITH TCIES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

In conversations with six members of the TCIES executive committee and two other officials within the TEA, the following generalizations emerged.

1. The TCIES Executive Committee.

The committee has representatives from the Texas Education Agency, the professional associations, colleges and universities, service centers and local school districts. In general these individuals represent their respective groups and tend to keep the interests of these groups in mind at meetings. Any member could, if he wished, however, advocate any line that seemed useful to him; in that sense, members can be independent of their constituencies.

College and university people seem especially willing to "make a case" for their "party's" point of view. Their attitude is in constrast to that of the school districts, who seem not as fully aware of their responsibilities and interests. The education service center seems clear in its mission and is reported to be a good way "to get closer to the school district." One respondent noted that the "harvest is ready," for professional associations in teacher education to be involved, and, with "proper leadership" from the Texas State Teachers' Association the task will be easy. The Texas State Teachers' Association itself believes that the centers are "one of the best things that ever happened." Although they do not "have all the answers" they do provide "one way the professional teacher can become part of teacher education" and have a "greater voice."

In fact, the Texas State Teachers' Association is said to be working immediately toward two ends: (1) representation for professional associations on local Teacher Center boards equal to that of colleges and school districts. Accordingly, the Texas State Teachers' Association is working to revise the bylaws in existing local Teacher Centers and is pushing newly formed local Teacher Centers in this direction. The Texas State Teachers' Association would also like to have student representatives, selected by student NEA chapters, on local Teacher Center boards; (2) continuity. Currently the Texas State Teachers' Association local chapter presidents or other term officers serve as representatives to local Teacher Center boards. As a result, there is frequent turnover. The Texas State Teachers' Association would like to see the bylaws changed so that chapters could select a more or less permanent representative who would consequently be better informed and more effective.

It has been reported that, to date, the Texas State Teachers' Association members have not been very effective in providing inputs to local Teacher Center board meetings. Partly in response to this problem, the Texas State Teachers' Association has decided to provide guidelines and staff assistance to professional representatives.

Members do feel a real sense of responsibility, however, and it is believed that the teaching profession is now ready to serve effectively and to take a more positive approach to formulating teacher education. But they need help. A major problem is that the teachers asked to serve are all visible, busy people; it would be helpful if meeting schedules could be arranged with the teachers' work day in mind.

Some respondents speculate that effective involvement of professional associations may culminate in a new board for certification, legally and organizationally analogous to the present State Board of Examiners. Some say that the State Board of Education would be pleased by such a move. The belief is that the Texas Education Agency and the Texas State Teachers' Association can and would work together on such a development and that many persons in both agencies would welcome it.

2. The Executive Committee's input to decision making.

The board is advisory and is not directly involved in decision making. According to one respondent, however, board members have satisfactory opportunities to consider issues and to provide adequate input. In general, when an issue arises, the TCIES director, and his staff prepare agenda items and lay out possible alternatives. The agendas and pertinent material reach board members three to four days before the meeting. Some members feel that, since the material is sometimes bulky, there is not sufficient time to study it properly;

others do not share that concern. At the meeting remarks are usually directed at eliminating all but a few alternatives, providing input on those remaining, then leaving the final decision to the director. Although these discussions are reported at subsequent meetings, some members do not feel sufficiently involved in TCIES planning. Respondents report that the two to three hours of meeting time, plus the short leadtime before meetings, is not sufficient to consider the decisions properly and to obtain additional information. Thus some members feel that the committee could do more, and would welcome the opportunity to become more involved.

3. Nature of interaction of members.

The TCIES board was described as essentially free in its interaction. Special interests do, of course, come up as, for example, the pressure from institutions of higher education to continue to play the key role in teacher education, as opposed to the pressure from service centers to obtain a more vital role for themselves in the same arena. But the group is said to recognize its own political quality and tends to work in ways that balance out such special interests. So far as input from individual groups is concerned, colleges and universities are said to provide the most, with the service centers a close second. Texas Education Agency members feel less representative of any particular interest and tend to work for group balance. The school district people tend not to be as aggressive, probably because they are not as "status" conscious as the other representatives tend to be; also, in this situation, they are furthest removed from the roles they ordinarily play and, consequently do not feel as free as the others to argue. They are also the most recent members and have received little orientation. Although on the whole, input tends to follow a party line, discussions are reported to bring out all vantage points.

4. Characterizing Local Teacher Centers

a. The local Teacher Center concept.

It is the Texas Education Agency's prerogative to screen teacher education program proposals coming from the colleges. The Texas Education Agency is expected to take the lead in program change, although the initiative could come from either the Division of Teacher Education within the Texas Education Agency or from individual colleges. During the period of development of any program the division endeavors to consult with colleges so that by the time a program comes to it officially, it already has some acquaintance with it. The division screens proposals prior to their being submitted to the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education. It is advisory to the state board and was appointed by them. The state board always includes at least three classroom teachers.

The local Teacher Centers are required to "review" all college proposals prior to their submission to the Division of Teacher Education.

The local Teacher Center boards are advisory and the review is nothing more nor less than a consultation. Colleges are not required to respond to suggestions during these consultations and, generally, the Texas Education Agency usually receives a letter stating only that the consultation has occurred. If the college did not call for the local Teacher Center review, or the advice given during a consultation is not heeded, then the Texas Education Agency expects to receive notice from the local Teacher Center to that effect. If the local Teacher Center does not take that initiative, the Texas Education Agency cannot challenge a proposal. Apparently local Teacher Centers usually report the substance of a critique made of a proposal, although there is no formalized way to do that, nor is it required.

The local Teacher Center plays a strong role in involving both practitioners (teachers) and employers (school districts) in teacher education. Some respondents reported that professional preparation is no longer the prerogative of an institution of higher education and any college or university that insists on playing a unilateral role in this regard is simply out of touch with the world. Indeed, if a college or university becomes too protective, the profession may well decide that it is time to shift the focus of teacher education elsewhere, and such a decision is entirely within the realm of possibility. A local Teacher Center could, for example, simply contract for the instructional services it *wanted* from an institution of higher education.

Professional organizations might well determine that the responsibility for training should be theirs, and many superintendents in Texas feel that school districts could perform that function. At the local Teacher Center such diverse points of view can be openly discussed and agreements reached.

b. Descriptive dimensions.

In keeping with the comments on the local Teacher Center concept made above, one respondent emphasized that the state never contemplated that the local Teacher Centers would be anything more than an advisory board. Thus, no need was seen for operational funds: there would be no central office, no telephone bills, and no staff. All functions would be carried out by regrouping already existing staff and resources--directors of student teaching in colleges and universities, and others--within the individual institutions. Of course, there is the $50 stipend from SB 8 that some people feel will increasingly be diverted by school districts to local Teacher Centers. Apparently there is also some possibility that the funds provided by House Bill 240 for ten paid in-service days for all Texas teachers will be similarly diverted. The need for operational funds, however, depends, in part, on the different emerging local Teacher Center configurations.

The idea of a local Teacher Center as simply an advisory board was combined with another Teacher Center concept that had emerged from other federally funded programs: that these centers were administrative offices and performed actual activities. Historically, these two ideas have become meshed, at least in the TCIES funded local Teacher Centers. It is the local Teacher Centers that emphasize actual activities that use the SB 8 funds for a variety of purposes.

Another respondent referred to the same distinction between advisory board and project-operating local Teacher Centers by outlining two dimensions on which he felt local Teacher Centers could be characterized. Each of these dimensions form a continuum:

1. A managerial-operational continuum. Some local Teacher Centers, like San Antonio, see themselves as managerial organizations or holding companies; they do not engage in operational activities but set policy, raise funds, and so forth. Others, like Fort Worth, see themselves as operators of projects, and endeavor to stimulate and support local people who are working on problems of concern to them.
2. A centralized-decentralized dimension. Some local Teacher Centers have established a centralized operation like Fort Worth in which all local Teacher Center operations have a kind of central physical facility into which participants must come to avail themselves of resources and materials. Others, like Dallas, have set up a variety of operation centers that might even be transient as new problems arise and older ones are solved. These local Teacher Centers use what was described

as "commando tactics" in taking advantage of needs wherever and whenever they arise. In part, decentralization is likely to be found in geographically dispersed local Teacher Centers such as West Texas.

An additional factor was mentioned as important in any attempt at characterizing a local Teacher Center. This is the kind of stability found at the executive level of the institution. One respondent stated that those local Teacher Centers that suffer or have suffered frequent changes in leadership do not do as well as those at which there is some continuity. In El Paso, for example, both the university dean and the school district superintendent were replaced at the same time, influencing the Teacher Center adversely. In Dallas, the directors of the center were replaced frequently, and, although this was seen by some as having severely slowed the project, a core group of individuals remained to lend it continuity. There were no changes at a higher level of management, however, to interfere with the development of the Teacher Center in matters of policy. In West Texas, the major personalities responsible for the development of the Teacher Center have remained associated with it since its early years. However, it has been reported that recent changes in the presidential and vice presidential levels of West Texas State University are blocking those collaborative relationships which the Teacher Center has managed to establish as a matter of policy or principle.

3. Activities and payoffs. Indications are that programmatic efforts are coming into much better focus at both TCIES and local Teacher Center levels. It is said that, as far as TCIES is concerned, the board spends much of its time dealing with three elements: competency-based teacher education, increasing involvement of TCIES in local Teacher Centers in designing in-service programs for teachers not limited to student teacher supervisors, and bilingual education. These foci are described as having emerged through an "inductive approach" and depend on needs identified at the local Teacher Center level. The impression is that the local Teacher Centers themselves are "settling down" to particular program areas; for example, the preservice undergraduate competency-based teacher education program at Houston and the emphasis on local problem solving in Fort Worth.

One respondent felt that three general payoffs of local Teacher Center activity are beginning to become apparent:

a. Considerable progress is being made toward the goal of interaction between consumers and producers of teacher education. Collaboration at the operational level is going on apace. The case of Fort Worth was specifically cited as an example of intergroup communication becoming commonplace. It was estimated that most persons involved with the local Teacher Center in Fort Worth average from two to three contacts per week with persons from other groups. In general, the local Teacher Center is considered to have worked out well as a major strategy for group interaction and for matching needs with programs.

b. Considerable emphasis and activity is being generated to make local Teacher Centers centers of in-service activity. This respondent felt that there is a definite shift in interest and effort from preservice to in-service training and that in-service training would be extended, not just for the student teacher supervisors, but for all teachers.

c. Outside resources made available through TCIES are having more generalized impact. For example, outside consultants and resource people, hired in relation to a particular project and activity, are said to be widely used and to be affecting university and school people generally. Also, individual schools are not the only beneficiaries; central administrations of school districts are said to have been touched as well.

5. The emerging interest in collaboration.

The impression is readily formed from all of the interviews conducted that there is an earnest interest in having universities, school districts, and professional associations jointly influence teacher education. The comment was made that twenty-one TCIES-funded local Teacher Centers now work with about 50 percent of all student teachers in Texas. Thus, a substantial proportion of student teacher activity is beginning to come under Teacher Center review. As the Teacher Centers become better established and increase their effectiveness, they will undoubtedly influence the student teaching experience markedly and thus also in-service and preservice education. A dramatic development is that the Council of Education Deans is said to have joined the Texas State Teachers' Association in February of 1975. And this spirit of collaboration is not limited to local Teacher Center board activities. It has now permeated even the Texas Education Agency, and the legislature itself is said to be interested in the idea. As one person put it, "The state has developed a structure by which the three vested interest groups can sit around a table" and discuss their concerns and interests in teacher education. Now they must exert themselves, demand to be heard, and take an active role. In other words, the next move is up to them.

In Texas, however, there are at least two conflicting views on how change in teacher education may come about; by mandated change or discretionary change. The basic idea behind mandated change is that any new thrust must be formalized and put into law or it will amount to little more than talk. Discretionary change holds that no change can be mandated and that, in fact, attempts at legislating change end up diluting and retarding it. Also, under this view legislated changes are seen as eventually becoming barriers to change themselves, since time has a way of shifting people's ideas about what is necessary, important, and changeable. One of the most notable efforts at mandated change in Texas has been that of competency-based teacher education. Competency-based teacher education also became the theme around which much collaborative activity took concrete definition. The idea of competencies lent itself naturally to what must be a major problem in any collaborative attempt, namely, deciding what it is that one wants to work on together, what the aims are, and who will be responsible for what.

Competency-based teacher education became a state mandate in 1972. In 1974-75, however, the attorney general rendered the opinion that the state board does not have the power to mandate competency-based teacher education for all institutions. Since competency-based teacher education had become a vehicle for so much of the collaborative activity among universities, school districts, and professional associations, this was certainly an important development. While in many places such as Dallas and West Texas, enough interest in and momentum in competency-based teacher education had been obtained to sustain it, a slowdown in implementation was said to be noticeable. There are few, if any, institutional rewards for the effort of designing and implementing competency-based teacher education, so a legal mandate at least provided a rationale, though some people insisted that competency-based teacher education interfered with academic freedom.

For the attorney general, of course, competency-based teacher education as an ideology or an attempt at mandated change was peripheral. What mattered was that a statute passed in 1905 had created teachers colleges and it applied to the seven schools still in existence. The law held that, on graduation, students were entitled to a first class Texas certificate, which amounted to saying that if they got a degree they were entitled to certification. As has happened to other statutes, of course, this one was generalized to cover the approximately sixty colleges now in existence, even though none are any longer purely teachers colleges. As already implied, although the opinions was raised in connection with competency-based teacher education, it was not singled out. The larger question is, for example, whether the state can mandate anything at all, and if competency-based teacher education cannot stand up under the opinion, then neither can the mandated Teacher Centers. In the opinion of one of the respondents, the state might be wise to recognize that it is in a legal mess, and that a study should be launched to clean it up. If the attorney general's opinion is assumed to be correct, then the implication is that the whole Texas Education Agency framework must be reviewed. With all this uncertainty, some respondents suggested that the agency internalize the Teacher Center program, make the state the fiscal agency, and allow it to become an agency function.

Another question that arises is the role that the federal government should play with regard to the Teacher Center program. Continued financial assistance on the part of the federal government would permit the effort in Texas to exist for another year while these legal uncertainties are sorted out. Over the long haul, however, one respondent felt that it was essential for the federal government to be able to collect some data on important characteristics of the centers with more precision than has been possible up to this time. Unless this is done, there will be no way of telling whether federal money is or is not planting a seed. He suggested that experience now shows two dimensions to be crucial, and that work is in progress on ways to establish a profile on each of them. The two dimensions would dmonstrate what he called structural potential and process potential. Structural potential refers to the existence of indices that lead you to believe that cooperative activity is likely to take place; an example is a viable link or connection between a Teacher Center and the state. Process potential demonstrates evidence that each partner is working with concepts of systematic change. Two particularly difficult problems arise here: one is to know how to document the impact of a particular program, the other is to help professional people assess their needs. It is with regard to the latter program that the need for collaboration among different institutions and organizations becomes paramount, for colleges certainly cannot find out what the goals of the schools should be by themselves.

P. GENERAL REMARKS

Collaboration is a slippery matter. Everyone has had the experience of being a member of a group charged with accomplishing something and has faced the confusion involved in achieving enough cohesion to work cooperatively and productively. Typically, just when, as a group member, one thinks that things have become fairly well sorted out, some new situation arises which makes one question whether the group has made any progress in working effectively together or whether that is even possible. It is useful, due to this confusion, to consider for a moment an analogy between the dynamics of an advisory council and some generalizations that may be made about the dynamics of groups generally.

On occasion it was possible to see council members congratulating each other on the "openness" of their conversations and the honesty with which they felt they confronted and resolved their differences. It might be a mistake, however, to consider such conversation about their interaction as an example of the openness and honesty for which they strive. Instead, one may consider such conversations as "testing" behavior on the part of the members and a first attempt at becoming conscious of the process involved. Such comments can then be understood to have a symbolic value--standing for attempts at establishing new norms rather than representing existing norms. Conversations of this type are common in the early development of a "group" when members have successfully completed a collaborative task and are just as relieved that the moment is over as they are happy that they survived it. The collaborative bond between members can hardly be said to have been tested in such a situation although certainly a foundation may have been laid. Similarly, councils may sometimes appear more united in their opposition to an outside force than on a common goal. Members of a group can be driven together in common opposition to an outside force and later find--upon removal of that force--that they have less in common than they first supposed or at least that they have been protected from the opportunity of going through what one person termed, in a different context, the "bloody business" of recognizing and accepting their own and each other's differences. It is easier to unite in defense or opposition to an outside constraint than it is to work at establishing collaborative relationships. In fact it may be a relief that such a constraint has arisen since it provides a good rationale for discontinuing the painful attempt at collaboration. For such reasons indices of collaboration which have been discussed in this volume may be doubted. But these comments are made not to cast a doubtful eye on the attempts at collaboration made in Texas but to further point out how difficult an undertaking it is to bring together diverse groups in an already complicated issue. More subtle, less well understood, and harder to study intra and interpersonal and intergroup dynamics play a critical, determining role in setting up organizational structures. Merely to insist that the topic of collaboration be looked at is an unusual and courageous step for it is bound to touch on sensitive matters. Yet studying it also draws the actors' attention to it and may prod its nourishment--a point perhaps not lost on those who commissioned the study.

Such considerations of the dynamics of human interaction aside, this section will now summarize some general issues about collaboration that emerged in the course of the study. The comments will be organized under the headings of mission, organizational structure, and communication.

1. The Teacher Center Mission It was stressed by numerous respondents that the professional preparation of teachers is no longer the prerogative of any single institution. Moreover, collaboration on this task among different partners such as the universities, the school districts, the professional associations, the service centers and the community must amount to more than just a polite association. Collaboration among these groups is essential for the mutual resolution of common problems if not also to the survival of different parties. But in order for the different parties to collaborate there must be some agreement identifying the goals and functions of a Teacher Center.

The interviews seem to show that identifying a mission or clarifying the Teacher Center concept is a developmental and evolutionary process. At first there may be some general statements which are agreed to on paper. Time and minimal resources are also set aside by the different partners. The commitment to collaboration may, at that point, be superficial or at least untested but as the Teacher Center members become engaged in different activities new criteria of commitment emerge. Engaging in actual activities provides a live test, serves to clarify the early thrust and encourages the hard task of ordering good intentions. All of this, however, takes time. Often clarification of the Teacher Center concept is gained by realizing what it is not.

Once there is agreement on what purposes a Teacher Center might realistically serve, a milestone may have been reached but an unlimited number of additional questions are also raised. For example, the originators of the Teacher Center in Texas thought that their operating expenses could be paid through existing university and school district budgets. This notion makes sense providing a Teacher Center becomes involved only in the placement of teachers. But many Teacher Centers have progressed beyond this original point to include other functions and it may now be necessary for the legislature to rethink that basic funding scheme. Not until a Teacher Center knows what it is or knows what it wishes to become can it decide, for example, whether it needs space and if so what kind of space it requires. As basic purposes are debated the Teacher Center's scope of authority may also come into question. At present different levels or spheres of authority may be found among the Teacher Centers: in San Antonio the council or board is advisory; in Fort Worth it makes policy; and in Houston it assumes certain implementation functions.

Besides the need for funds or the need to clarify the authority of a Teacher Center council relative to that of other existing bodies, a number of other problems also arise in defining the Teacher Center mission. The different Teacher Center members may bring vastly different experiences and points of view to the table which may make for constructive or destructive conflict. Part of the problem is defining the roles of the different members. Whatever collaboration may mean, insisting on something like parity may be a simplistic solution. Since the partners involved differ both in their interests and what they can contribute, it seems sensible to determine the abilities of each partner and what their contribution to the center might be. Insisting on equal responsibilities for each member encourages people to look for ways in which they can assert their veto power rather than for ways in which they can contribute. This is no small problem. The need to ensure that each member adequately contributes to the deliberations of the council may be beyond the capabilities of any organizational structure and perhaps can only be satisfied by the integrity of those with decision-making responsibility.

Finally, there must be some reward for both the member institutions and the individual representatives involved. This is particularly important in the case of the universities whose reward systems do not appear at all compatible with the functions of the Teacher Center. This too involves understanding what the Teacher Center is so that rewards can be made to correspond to its actual functions. Professional schools such as schools of education may have to set their own standards for promotion (different from those regulating their universities as a whole) which are in keeping with the different roles they play relative to their client systems. Collaboration may not get far without such a move.

2. Organizational Structure Given that form follows function, we can now consider the organizational structure appropriate to the mission of a Teacher Center. At the state level this question involves deciding where Teacher Centers should be located to properly serve the state and relate effectively to the way the education service centers are distributed. At the local level organizational structures must be found to accomodate different mandates carrying out different influence. SB 8 specified that the universities and the school districts should cooperate in student teacher education centers. In fact, it specifies that the colleges or universities should be the ones to initiate the efforts and hence may give them an influential edge from the start. The state standards, though not carrying the force of law, specified that the professions should also be included. And TCIES sought to make the funds it was prepared to allocate to local Teacher Centers contingent on the inclusion of the education service centers and the community on their advisory councils. Due to these conflicts it is not often clear to the members by what authority they sit on the council although it is clear to them that they have differing degrees of power. At present the basic organizational unit for the Teacher Centers has not been determined.

The size of a council and its ability to effectively make decisions are obviously related. At the moment council membership ranges from about a dozen to nearly seventy people. When large numbers of representatives are involved a complicated system of committees and subcommittees has been established which creates logistical problems, complicated voting procedures, and inconsistent terms of service. Large groups know they cannot be viable and hence many important decisions are either made at the committee level or else privately. In some cases a partner such as the education service center or the community may not be represented on the program or executive committee involved and thus loses its chance to influence the decisions made.

A challenge still facing the Teacher Centers which were part of this study, and probably most other Teacher Centers as well, is to write an effective and comprehensive set of bylaws. This, too, is probably an evolutionary process. As the different partners work together, defining the rules of membership and procedure will become increasingly important, and only after operating for several years do some Teacher Centers find it possible to become specific about criteria for membership, who may or may not chair a committee, how representatives are chosen, and so on. It seems that only after members have been involved in some activity do things like rules governing tenure and a quorum become important. Nevertheless, generally it is preferable to have bylaws written incrementally based on needs arising from experience than to adopt a standard set of procedures. The Teacher Center is, after all, a unique organization and rules governing it must fit its purposes.

As an organization's goals change, and as the environment within which it operates changes, the organization may be called upon to change its structure. Also, as is evident in Texas, so much in an environment may remain continuously uncertain or in flux (legal mandates, funding constraints or demands, changing personnel or membership and so on) that a Teacher Center finds it desirable to maintain a flexible organizational posture. Although this makes the organization adaptable and responsive to changing currents it carries the risk of purposeless activity which diminishes the organization's effect. Thus, Teacher Centers may perhaps be usefully classified according to the extent to which they retain a loose changing posture or they crystalize around a set of goals. Perhaps the managerial-operational continuum and the centralized-decentralized dimension mentioned in Section N would be pertinent to the construction of such a classification scheme. It is easy to underestimate the role that the loose organizational arrangements that characterize some of the Teacher Centers have played in their development. It may have been impossible to achieve as much as has been achieved in Texas if the Teacher Centers had not been able to use the different sources of funds which were available. This may be particularly so in the case of TCIES at the state level which had to conform to the changing national and state programs and politics.

3. Communication Obviously a collaborative effort such as a Teacher Center will be severely hindered in its operation unless healthy communication channels exist within the organization and with its various links to the environment.

The organizational structure of a Teacher Center will influence the amount and kind of communication that is possible. Very large advisory councils may be the result of attempting to adequately represent different groups interested in teacher education, but their very size may seriously decrease the opportunity people have to know one another and eventually to collaborate. A certain amount of informal interaction is probably necessary in order to establish a basis for effective communication on the many issues that confront a Teacher Center.

Probably no collaborative effort is possible until there exists sufficient unanimity on goals, purposes and structure. Lack of such agreement is bound to lead to subterfuge which in the long run will be counterproductive. On the other hand, there will always be multiple viewpoints, and in that sense, what is needed is not so much a single voice but a way of harmonizing the different voices. Besides building an effective internal communication system among members the representatives themselves must find ways of keeping their constituents properly informed. Although the advisory councils are thought of as an input mechanism they must function just as effectively the other way around: to make member organizations aware of what happens in the Teacher Center. Without this, it is unlikely that interest by member organizations in favor of the Teacher Centers will grow. This not only raises the question of what is effective communication but also who the representatives of a given organization might be. Typically, each member group has the feeling that "you can't understand us unless you're one of us." This emphasizes the difficulty that groups have communicating their point of view to others. Some organizations like universities and school districts may find it easier to choose representatives. Deans or administrators exist which make them likely candidates although it is not always clear that they would be the best representatives. The community, on the other hand, has no such ready-made functionary who could represent it and its problem is more acute.

At present some representatives have more power to commit their organizations than do others, although member organizations may always choose to veto or not endorse an action their representative has taken. Some representatives feel hampered because they must, in effect, poll their membership before they can fully support certain actions. Obviously both the veto power and the different degrees to which representatives can commit their organizations make collaboration difficult.

Some councils also struggle with preparing adequate minutes and agendas, failing to make these available to council members in sufficient time before a council meeting so they may have the opportunity to study them thoroughly. This is important not only because representatives have to be properly informed but also because suspicion and distrust can be created when such logistics are not handled properly. It may look as though there is a strategy to impede discussion and input to decision making.

A number of different strategies are evident in attempts at facilitating communication. Coordination committees have been established at the school district level, and Teacher Center representatives have gone to various colleges and universities in order to explain their program. In order to achieve better understanding among the major partners, representatives have been chosen who are at least familiar with the cultures of the schools and universities. However, formal attempts at orienting new members (and organizations to each other) might be helpful as well as greater emphasis on what each member group stands to gain from cooperative participation. It is also becoming clear to the Teacher Centers visited that rules of membership must not be disadvantageous to particular groups. For example, it is important not to change representatives too often since knowledge about the needs of the Teacher Center and the necessary status to act on that knowledge is only earned over time.

Finally, some vehicle must be found to make effective contact with the Texas Education Agency available to each Teacher Center. Some, of course, have a state representative sitting on their council but this will not be possible for each Teacher Center. A type of ombudsman is needed who will be particularly responsive to the needs of the local Teacher Centers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Peper, John. The First Annual Report: The Texas Teacher Center, June 30, 1973, Volume IV. (I 80 Tex)

Guba, Egon, Final Report: The Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, June 30, 1974. (I 91 Tex)

Evaluation Research Center, The Second Annual Report: The Texas Teacher Center, August 31, 1974. (I 90 Tex)